

# MODERN LANGUAGE NOTES.

Baltimore, January, 1895.

## UNITY OF PLACE IN *LE CID*.

THIS heading may be considered begging the question at issue, since *le Cid* is generally supposed to disregard unity of place, and in fact does so in the performances given by the Comédie française at the present day. Still the critics are by no means agreed that the stage managers are right in their conclusions, though they themselves are uncertain as to what the original setting really was. Voltaire—to cite one of the most eminent among them—thinks that unity of place would be evident to the spectator, if *le Cid* were only produced with scenery worthy of its author, in other words if it used the multiplex stage decoration.

So the first point to be settled would be the kind of scenery which Corneille found ready at hand, the scenery he inherited from his predecessors; and the second to ascertain how he adapted this scenery to his own ends. Rigal, in his important work on Alexandre Hardy, has discussed the first question at length, and has given his conclusions regarding the second. He shows beyond a doubt that, at the time when Corneille began to solicit popular applause at the Marais theater, the multiplex scenery was the usual form of stage setting, though movable scenery was often employed. The multiplex form of decoration had been handed down from the open-air stage of the Fraternity of the Passion to the more restricted stage of the Hôtel de Bourgogne. In it the various settings for the different localities were juxtaposed on the stage—centered around the street or square in the middle—and remained there throughout the entire play, the changes being indicated by the actors going from one to the other as occasion demanded. For instance, in a tragicomedy of the Hôtel de Bourgogne, the centre of the stage might be an open space representing a square in Rome, the right a series of houses extending from Rome to Jerusalem, and the left, perhaps, the Mediterranean sea. A curtain in the background of

the open space might rise at the opportune moment to reveal another house or street of the imperial city. To be sure, this scenery was the property of one particular theater, but at the same time it must have been the model for the decorations prepared for Mondory's troupe of the Marais, and have differed from them only in extent and variety.

The stage, which Corneille as a citizen of the provinces knew, must have been more simple than even the modified scenery of the Marais; for the companies of actors who visited Rouen could not have transported any of their stage properties with them, since these belonged to the owners of the Hôtel de Bourgogne and were leased only with that theater. The scenery which the actors used on their tours was undoubtedly reduced to the smallest dimensions possible, and probably depended largely on the indulgent fancy of their audiences, who would gladly put up with a mere indication for the sake of the play. So that it is to be supposed—as Rigal does—that the less spectacular plays were alone given in the provinces, and that it is there and not in Paris that the beginnings of the classical theater are to be found. Corneille, of course, had visited the capital before he composed his first play, and must have attended performances at the Hôtel de Bourgogne. His evident familiarity, too, with the comedies of Latin antiquity may have suggested a more regular place of action than the example of Hardy and the Parisian playwrights could have afforded him.

However this may be, he himself states in the "Examen" to *Mélite* that it was his "common sense" which made him discover unity of action, and gave him an "aversion for that license which puts Paris, Rome and Constantinople on the same stage." Consequently he limited the localities in *Mélite* to the area of one town, Paris. But in *Clitandre*, which was written to please the old theatergoers who had found *Mélite* too simple and unemotional, the multiplex decoration is taken advantage of, and the stage is a king's castle with forests adjoining, as in the tragi-comedies of Hardy. Still Corneille yields even here to one requirement of the new school, and re-

stricts the time of the action to twenty-four hours.

The influence of Horace and his *Ars poetica*, now began to assert itself, and in *la Veuve* the dramatist returns to the order of *Mélite* so far as it affected the place, and tries a new idea of his own to satisfy the demands for unity of time. In the preface to *la Veuve* he claims that he always "observes inviolate" unity of place and action. As for the first he says:

"tantôt je la resserre à la seule grandeur du théâtre, et tantôt je l'étends jusqu'à toute une ville, comme en cette pièce. Je l'ai poussé dans le *Clitandre* jusques aux lieux où l'on peut aller dans les vingt et quatre heures; mais bien que j'en pusse trouver de bons garants et de grands exemples dans les vieux et nouveaux siècles, j'estime qu'il n'est que meilleur de se passer de leur imitation en ce point."

And he promises some day to consider the question more at length. His invention for unity of time was a day to each act, or five days for the whole play. This is a compromise, as he states, between the rules of the purists and the freedom of the French stage. It is possible he already had in mind some idea of inventing a middle term for unity of place also.

The preface of *la Veuve* was printed in March, 1634. The next play of Corneille, *la Galerie du Palais*, was not edited until February, 1637, and its preface (a dedication) makes no comments on its construction. Yet so far as unity of time is concerned it continues the idea of a day for each act. For place there are two localities. The one temporary and probably occupying the whole stage at first, the other more permanent and consisting of a street bordered by houses, in which some of the female characters lived. All came into the street to carry on their dialogue, a proceeding not relished by the poet, but necessary, as he writes in the "Examen" of 1660, "pour trouver cette rigoureuse unité de lieu qu'exigent les grands réguliers." The first decoration appears for a while at the end of the fourth act.

*La Suivante*, which followed *la Galerie du Palais*, probably in the season of 1633-34, yet was not published until the quarrel of *le*

*Cid* was at its height, observed both the unities of time and place in the sense of the critics, though Corneille protested against them in his dedication of 1637, and in 1660 in his "Examen," claims that what his actors speak in the street would be better said in their houses which border the street on either side. Still he was evidently satisfied with this kind of unity in 1634, though in the next play, *la Place Royale*, he finds himself forced to modify it by putting his heroine in her own chamber during one soliloquy. The multiplex decoration would easily admit of this, and involved no moving of scenery.

When our author, after this series of successful comedies, was ready to try his Muse in higher flights, and test his powers as a tragic writer, he still disagreed with the ancients to a slight extent and infringed on strict unity of place. He confesses in the "Examen" to *Médée* that he could not bring himself to Seneca's standard in this particular, but makes the heroine of the piece prepare her enchantments in her own room. Another character he puts in prison, only to regret it later on, and affirm that guards would have answered the same purpose much better. So it is evident that the multiplex scenery was made use of again here just as in *la Place Royale*. The next play, *L'Illusion comique*, is known to have been performed with the stage setting in vogue at the time, for the register of the machinist, who prepared the decorations for it, has been preserved. A significant passage in his directions is where "carcans ou menottes" are required. These appliances must refer to the seventh scene of the fourth act, where the text reads *CLINDOR en prison*, and would go to prove that Corneille here employed the symbol for the reality, doing away with the actual prison for the same reasons, perhaps, which he afterwards advanced in the "Examen" to *Médée*.

*L'Illusion comique* was performed by the actors of the Hôtel de Bourgogne, and very likely in the same season which saw *Médée* given by Mondory and his associates. If this is so, then a year and a half must have elapsed before Corneille tried the stage again with the production of *le Cid*. Such an interval seems more probable than the com-

monly received one of a few months, since not only the verse and language of *le Cid* reveal most careful study on the part of its author, but also because the difficulties attending its construction and adaptation to French dramatic standards, could have been surmounted only after many trials and much self-criticism. The comedians, too, seem to have been aware of the importance of the venture, for the enemies of Corneille, in the dispute which followed the successful performance of the play, claim that the acting and the handsome clothes of the actors were the chief factors in the fame it attained. Unusual efforts had been made, at all events, to have the theatrical properties of *le Cid* everything that could be desired. This care affords another proof of the weight Corneille himself attached to his new departure.

The amount of time spent in elaborating the piece leaves nowhere so clear a trace as in its observance, or non-observance, of the unities. A comparison of *le Cid* with its source is all that is necessary for absolute conviction on this point. The publicity given to the part of the Infanta in the French play, with the evident purpose of eulogizing the hero, interrupts its action, if it does not destroy its unity; while the transformation of the mad prince Sancho into a mere suitor for the heroine's hand, thus making him a counterpart to the Infanta, could have been the outcome only of mature deliberation. To attain unity of time, it was necessary also to reduce the events of three years to the limits of twenty-four hours. Corneille accomplished this feat to his own discomfiture, as he afterwards admits. Yet the final result could not have been reached until after many unsatisfactory trials. In other words, the whole make-up of the play as well as the final preparation of the actors, would indicate a much longer period of inception than the few months generally assigned to it, and for these reasons the date of *l'illusion comique* may be better placed in the season 1634-35, than in the winter following.

The same care must have attended the setting of the play which was shown in its action and duration. The original drama of Guillen de Castro used all Spain for its theater. Cor-

neille's play was confined to the territory of one town, and evidently to the neighborhood of one street or square. But here the contemporaries have handed down a word of warning. Scudéry complains in his *Observations*:

"disons encore que le théâtre en est si mal entendu, qu'un même lieu représentant l'appartement du Roi, celui de l'Infante, la maison de Chimène et la rue, presque sans changer de face, le spectateur ne sait le plus souvent où sont les acteurs."

The Academy agrees in this criticism, while admitting that the defect is not a new one:

"Quant au théâtre, il n'y a personne à qui il ne soit évident qu'il est mal entendu dans ce poème, et qu'une même scène y représente plusieurs lieux. Il est vrai que c'est un défaut que l'on trouve en la plupart de nos poèmes dramatiques, et auquel il semble que la négligence des poètes ait accoutumé les spectateurs. Mais l'auteur de celui-ci, s'étant mis si à l'étroit pour y faire rencontrer l'unité du jour, devait bien aussi s'efforcer d'y faire rencontrer celle du lieu, qui est bien autant nécessaire que l'autre, et faute d'être observée avec soin, produit dans l'esprit des spectateurs autant ou plus de confusion et d'obscurité."

The meaning of these criticisms is obvious, and so far as the spectator could see, it is clear that the action of *le Cid* was carried on in one place. Rigal has explained this effect (*Alexandre Hardy*, p. 206) by supposing that the multiplex decoration was used, without any distinct divisions among the different pieces of scenery, or any attention being paid to them by the actors, who would all stand on the same spot. This explanation seems to be the correct one and, so far as the last half of it is concerned, is borne out by Mondory's letter to Balzac dated the eighteenth of January, 1637, not many days after the first performance of the play:

"La foule a été si grande à nos portes, et notre lieu s'est trouvé si petit, que les recoins du théâtre qui servaient les autres fois comme de niches aux pages, ont été des places de faveur pour les cordons bleus, et la scène y a été d'ordinaire parée de croix de chevaliers de l'ordre."

Of course under such circumstances unity of place, except so far as the background might change, was unavoidable; and the fact that the comedians allowed their stage to be so



encroached upon, shows that their desire to do all they could for the success of *le Cid* was not heightened by any novelties in the way of scenery. We have seen Corneille approaching this notion of the place of action in his previous plays, though hesitating, as in *la Place Royale* and *Médée*, to entirely adopt it.

What was unusual in *le Cid* was the position of the actors in the middle of the stage, whatever might be the spot where they were supposed to be. The scenery, therefore, must have been based on the multiplex model, for Scudéry's "sans changer de face" was a technical term for different compartments in the same decoration, and does not signify a change between scenes or acts.—The strictures of the Academy also point unmistakably to the multiplex decoration.—Consequently we are to suppose that Corneille wished to carry to its logical conclusion what he had already attempted, and had designated his places by separate buildings, grouped around an open space, into which the characters came, through the doors opening out of each particular structure. It was not a new idea at all; but it was an improbable one in such a combination of passions and events as *le Cid*. Corneille in his "Examen" alludes to the trouble which his place of action made for him and adds:

"Tout s'y passe donc dans Séville, et garde ainsi quelque espèce d'unité de lieu en général; mais le lieu particulier change de scène en scène, et tantôt c'est le palais du Roi, tantôt l'appartement de l'Infante, tantôt la maison de Chimène, et tantôt une rue ou place publique. On le détermine aisément pour les scènes détachées; mais pour celles qui ont leur liaison ensemble, comme les quatre dernières du premier acte, il est malaisé d'en choisir un qui convienne à toutes."

To escape this ambiguity he thinks that the spectators should "help the scenery," and suppose people walking who are standing still, or that a character (Don Diègue, for instance) has entered his house while he is still at the same place on the stage as before. The funeral rites of the Count demanded another stretch of the fancy, another "poetic fiction," and the dramatist, uncertain what to do with so puzzling a question, admits:

"J'ai cru plus à propos de les dérober à son (the spectator's) imagination par mon silence, aussi bien que le lieu précis de ces quatre

scènes du premier acte dont je viens de parler; et je m'assure que cet artifice m'a si bien réussi, que peu de personnes ont pris garde à l'un ni à l'autre, etc."

In the *Discours des Trois Unités*, which was printed in 1660, at the same time as this "Examen," Corneille discusses unity of place at length. He still affirms that the limits of one town suffice to make that unity, and that the stage could very well represent two or three places within the city walls. In citing instances from his plays he says of *le Cid*:

"comme la liaison de scènes n'y est pas gardée, le théâtre, dès le premier acte, est la maison de Chimène, l'appartement de l'Infante dans le palais du Roi, et la place publique; le second y ajoute la chambre du Roi; et sans doute il y a quelque excès dans cette licence."

To rectify such indefiniteness he suggests one of two things: either that changes of place should occur only between acts, as in *Cinna*, or that

"ces deux lieux n'eussent point besoin de diverses décorations, et qu'aucun des deux ne fût jamais nommé, mais seulement le lieu général où tous les deux sont compris, comme Paris, Rome, etc."

In that way the spectator, not having before him different scenery, would not be aware of a change of place on the part of the characters. But when two persons appear in the same act, who are so antagonistic to each other that the auditor's oblivion of the surroundings is not probable, Corneille proposes a compromise, by "theatrical fictions," which would make the place of action no particular room,

"mais une salle sur laquelle ouvrent ces divers appartements, à qui j'attribuerais deux privilèges: l'un que chacun de ceux qui y parleraient fût présumé y parler avec le même secret que s'il était dans sa chambre; l'autre, qu'au lieu que dans l'ordre commun il est quelque fois de la bienséance que ceux qui occupent le théâtre aillent trouver ceux qui sont dans leur cabinet pour parler à eux, ceux-ci pussent les venir trouver sur le théâtre, sans choquer cette bienséance, afin de conserver l'unité de lieu et la liaison des scènes."

Unless this compromise be admitted, Corneille confesses that he had observed, previous to 1660, unity of place in but three tragedies, *Horace*, *Polyculte* and *Pompée*.

The conclusion of the whole matter would be, then, that in *le Cid* Corneille had attempted



a fusion of the old and new, a compromise between the requirements of the purists and the freedom of Hardy's scenery, just as in *la Veuve* he had invented a middle term for the unity of time. But he was forced to give up the former as he had been obliged to yield the latter. Compromises were not in favor in his day, and are in fact but seldom met with in the annals of French history or literature. The spectator recognized in *le Cid* the fixed, multiplex decoration, not necessarily indefinite as Rigal supposes, otherwise Scudéry could hardly have written "presque sans changer de face," or the Academy have ranked it with the majority of the plays of the time. But instead of remaining within the various rooms bordering on the central open space, as in *Médée* and *la Place Royale*, or delaying on the thresholds, as in many of the scenes of Corneille's early comedies, the characters in *le Cid* came entirely away from their respective abiding-places and stood in the middle of the stage. Thus it may be easily explained why the last four scenes of the first act were indefinite in locality, as Corneille himself acknowledges. For these were connected by the characters of each speaking to one another, while the first scenes were separated from one another and from the following four by their entire lack of such communication. In the first two scenes of the original play the open square was the real place of the action, but in the third scene it was the assumed place, the Infanta and her attendants evidently coming thither from the door of her apartment (note the stage direction for line 61, *Le Page rentre*). Besides, the presence of a part of the audience on the sides of the stage forces us to allow that all the dialogue was carried on in the middle, while Corneille's admission that the four last scenes of the first act were indefinite in locality would indicate that he considered the first three definite. The only way this definiteness could be gained would be by the actors advancing from the buildings where they were supposed to be—as the dramatist had conceded in his previous plays and as he argued for in the *Discours des Trois Unités*. And this they must have done in the disconnected scenes of *le Cid*, while in those which were joined more closely together, one actor re-

mained in the square and the others came to him.

Here is the "theatrical fiction," a unity of place which satisfied neither the crowd, fond of spectacular effects, nor the strict disciples of Aristotle and Horace. And so it had to go the way Corneille's compromise for unity of time had gone. The outcome of the struggle was the banishment of general subjects from the classical stage of France. The scenery of *le Cid*, as Corneille planned it, would have seemed narrow and hesitating to the most indulgent of romanticists, yet it was still too varied for the Academy and the Hôtel de Rambouillet. Accordingly its author was forced to his last concession to their demands, and "Le théâtre est une chambre à quatre portes. Il faut un fauteuil pour le roi" (stage register of 1673), was the final realization of Corneille's words in the *Discours des Trois Unités*, of 1660.

F. M. WARREN.

Adelbert College.

#### GERMAN LOAN-WORDS AND THE SECOND SOUND SHIFTING.

It is well established that at different times, from the beginning of the O.H.G. period up to the late Middle Ages, certain consonant changes have taken place in the Upper German dialects. These changes are collectively known as the Second Sound Shifting, although not all consonants have permutated simultaneously throughout the whole linguistic area. It is rightly assumed that barring peculiar irreducible consonant groups and crossing influences, this change took place uniformly within the whole language, and that Modern High German represents the group of the Second Sound Shifting.\*

German philologists are accustomed to subject loan-words to the test of native words and to judge of the approximate age of their introduction by the manner in which the permutations have taken place. They seem to forget that what is true of changes within the language is not *eo ipso* true of changes in newcomers whose foreign garb marks them as belonging to a special class. As far as I

\*This is not the common view. H. C. G. v. J.

know, no one has as yet attempted to investigate German loan-words properly, for Kluge's etymologies cannot be regarded in this light. His method of putting foreign words to the test of the sound mutation leads him to some strange and amusing results.

Kluge<sup>1</sup> regards the affricata *pf* as the surest sign of an early borrowing, and to this *pf* we we shall mainly devote our attention. Under *Pfalz* we find: "As the permutation of L.G. *p* to H.G. *pf* indicates, the word must have been naturalized in G. as early as the beginning of the eighth century." Hence he argues that *Pfahl*, *Pfosten*, *Pflanze* had been introduced before the O.H.G. period. But it cannot be denied that the same O.H.G. has the words *Paar*, *Pacht*, *Palme*, *Pech*, *Petersilie* and many other words with unmutated *p*, and there is no reason to think that these are of a younger date than the former. Under *Treppe* he gives a form *Trepse* for the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. Are we to suppose two distinct borrowings from the North for it, one before and one after these two centuries? And how did the sound all of a sudden shift so late? Under *Pforte* we find: "Borrowed in the O.H.G. period in the eighth century, from Latin *porta* hence the absence of the premutation of *t* to *z*, which had been accomplished even in the seventh century." But we have learned above that the change to *pf* had been accomplished before the beginning of the eighth century, so there is left only the uncomfortably narrow limit between the seventh and the beginning of the eighth century, in which to slip *porta* into the language.

And now, since *t* has changed to *z* before the seventh century, Kluge places *Ziegel* in the fifth or sixth century. *Tafel*, says he, is borrowed in the O.H.G. period, *Zabel*, of course, to suit his theory, is older than O.H.G. But what reason is there to suppose that *Ziegel* like all other architectural terms is older than *Turm*, O. H. G. *turri*, *turra*? And what are we to do with *Ketzer* from *καθαρὸς* in the eleventh century (*θ* at that time could have come in only through the medium of Latin *th*

<sup>1</sup> Kluge's *Etymological Dictionary*, fourth edition, London, 1891. Since writing this I have consulted the fifth edition; there is no improvement there in the treatment of loan-words.

or *t*), which shows a shifting at such a late time?

Words introduced by the Church into Germany, Kluge says, show no mutation; yet Christianity was known and generally accepted in Upper Germany long before the eighth century, before *p* had gone over to *pf*, and he can adduce no good reason why *Pfaffe* should be older than *Papst* and *Pfarrer* than *predigen*.

These few examples illustrate the improper treatment of loan-words. The first mistake made by philologists in dealing with them arises from a misconception of the manner in which sound changes take place and perpetuate themselves. Winteler<sup>2</sup> says by implication that Upper German consonantism differs from Northern consonantism in that it distinguishes quantity of explosive sounds and not quality: *b* and *p*, *g* and *k*, *d* and *t* differ only by a greater or lesser pressure of the respective organs, and are all voiceless. H.G. *p*, *k*, *t*, when used in words which the Swiss hear for the first time are reproduced by them in an aspirated or affricated form, namely *ph*, *kh* or *kx*, *th*. The main features of the second sound shifting are greatly due to this U.G. aspiration. This, doubtless, has been a characteristic of U. G. speech upwards of ten centuries, and the O.H.G. and M.H.G. graphic signs *ph*, *ch*, *th* merely mark the first steps towards a stronger enunciation resulting in affricatae in two of the three sounds. *The second sound shifting owes its origin primarily to a particular locality and a particular people, not to a particular time.* At a later time, when the art of writing becomes general, this native change may be retarded and it may even retrograde, but of this I shall speak later. This affrication is going on to-day as much as in the time of the Carolingians, and will go on, as long as books and a closer intercourse with the learned do not exert a corrective influence.

Before entering upon a further discussion of the Germanic sound shifting, I shall illustrate the working and persistency of sound substitution in some Russian loan-words. In Russian as well as other Slavic idioms, *f* exists

<sup>2</sup> J. Winteler, "Die Kerenzer Mundart des Kantons Glarus in ihren Grundsätzen dargestellt." 1876.

only in foreign words. In native words the voiced dento-labial spirant frequently becomes voiceless before consonants and finally, so that in reality *f* is not an impossible sound to a Russian. Ever since the introduction of Christianity, Greek *θ* has been pronounced as *f* in Russian, hence *Afiny*, *Korins*, *Fomá* (Thomas). And even to-day a Slav's first attempt to pronounce *I think* is sure to result in *I fink*. In White Russian, *f* is preserved in all such foreign words as the White Russian continually hears pronounced by Germans and Poles living in his midst, but he invariably at first hearing will change all his *f*'s of foreign words to *xv* or even *χ*. So, while we find in W. Russian *fura*, *figura*, *sefer*, *sal's*, other foreign words *fon*, e.g. *ar fest*, *fortuna*, *fartuk*, *oficér* become *xvonar*, *xvest*, *xvortuna*, *xvartuk*, *axvicer*; and the Graeco-Russian names *Geodosij*, *Geodor* become *Xvedós*, *Xvjódor* or even *Xadós*, *Xadór*. Now *xv* has been for many centuries a distinctive Russian combination, and in two out of six O. Slavonic words with initial *xv* recorded by Miklosich, Russian influence is suspected.<sup>3</sup> We see here a process of sound mutation in operation for many centuries and one not likely soon to cease.

In Silesian dialects the initial affricata *pf* has advanced to simple *f*, while medial and final *pf* or *f* have retrograded to *p*,<sup>4</sup> but owing to book influence *pf* is still felt as a legitimate correspondent to L.G. or foreign *p*; <sup>5</sup> hence we find the forms *Supfe*, *Trepfe*, *Klapfer*, *Klumpfen*, and what is still stranger, Polish *pieniądze* has undergone sound shifting and has become *Phinunse*.<sup>6</sup> Another example of aspiration is *Töbich* for *Tabak*,<sup>7</sup> which is certainly a modern word. More frequently, however, the

<sup>3</sup> Franz Miklosich, *Vergleichende Grammatik der slavischen Sprachen*, I, 239.

<sup>4</sup> Karl Weinhold, *Ueber deutsche Dialectforschung*, etc., p. 73.

<sup>5</sup> *Ibid.* Meines wissens wird nur (aus religiöser Scheu) in Schepfer *creator* das *pf* rein gesprochen; das gefälsz zum schepfen heiszt Schepper. Formen wie *Supfe*, *Trepfe* sind wol aus missverständener Sucht recht rein zu sprechen zu deuten, oder sind sie die streng hochdeutschen Formen?

<sup>6</sup> *Ibid.* p. 74. Das polnische Wort *pieniądze* Geld (aus dem deutschen Pfennig entlehnt) hat bei der Rückaufnahme in das deutsch-schlesische die Lautverschiebung ergriffen: *Phinunse* (Trebnitz).

<sup>7</sup> *Ibid.* p. 85.

reverse process of softening has taken place in consequence of the checking influence of books.<sup>8</sup>

In the Kerenz dialect initial *pf* corresponds to U.G. *pf*.<sup>9</sup> Loanwords introduced through modern German change their initial *p* to *ph*, while those that came in through M.H.G. (book-language) show unmutated *p* or even *b*. Now *ph* is the nearest approach to *pf*: *Phak* Pack, *phur* pur, *Phersu* Person, *Phauli* Paul, "ein in Bauernfamilien noch fremder Name."<sup>10</sup> So, too, Gothic *k* has become *x*, while M.H.G. *k* invariably sounds *kx* (*kχ*), and in other Swiss dialects *kx* corresponds to organic Gothic *k*.<sup>11</sup>

When we say that in Upper German the permutation *pf* for *p* was accomplished in the seventh century, we merely mean that it was then universally accomplished for native words, but the change in newly introduced foreign words may take place for many centuries later and is not excluded even to-day in cases where book influence is not possible.

Another error is to suppose that all foreign words adopted before the seventh century must have undergone the soundchange together with native words. If the origin of the word is not transparent and it offers no strange combinations, then naturally it is subjected to the same treatment as German words. The word, however, may have originated in Latin

<sup>8</sup> The softening of *p* to *b*, *k* to *g*, *t* to *d*, so common in M.H.G., and the reverse process of hardening no doubt arise from the absence of a quantitative difference between the mediae and tenues in the Upper German dialects. While the sandhi rules of Notker's canon may have had sound foundation in actual differentiation, yet on the whole the interchange of mediae with tenues or, to speak with Winteler, of fortes with lenes is rather arbitrary in M.H.G. The Silesian dialects distinguish between mediae and tenues, but evidently owing to book influence foreign words appear in the M.H.G. form. "Diese Neigung des deutschen, fremde Labialtenues zu erweichen, wo sie nicht aspiriert wurde, erscheint bekanntlich mhd. in ausgedehnter Weise," Weinhold, *ibid.* p. 72.

<sup>9</sup> J. Winteler, *Die Kerenzer Mundart*, p. 44.

<sup>10</sup> *Ibid.* p. 56. In Uebereinstimmung mit dem mhd. erscheint *b* für welches *p*, meist im Anlaut, z. B.: *balme*, etc. .... doch haben andere die Fortis behalten, z. B. *par* .... während noch andere, offenbar durch das hochdeutsche vermittelte, die Aspirata aufweisen.

<sup>11</sup> *Ibid.* p. 50 and 52. A curious case of a loss of a supposed U.G. sound mutation is seen in G. *Zins*, Latin *census*, which in O. Saxon became *tins*.



books and its origin may long be present in the mind of the speaker, or it may be a Romance word for some commodity or luxury accessible only to the upper classes, who are aware of its foreign origin or even are conversant with the foreign language. In this case a word may withstand the sound shifting for an indefinite time, or, at some later time, it may become the common property of the lower classes and it may undergo the sound change.

Words referring to Church and religion form a large group of book words whose Latin origin was continually before the eyes of priests and communicants, and it is not to be wondered at that *Priester, Papst, Dom, Pein, Plage, predigen, Kreuz, Altar* should show no sound shifting, and yet we find *phine, pflige, pflöge* (Lexer). Where, however, the corrective of the Latin book language was absent and the word was diffused among the masses, the sound change could have taken place even at a later period. There is no reason to doubt the origin of *Pfaffe* from Middle Latin *papa* and *Pfarre* from *parrochia*. What Kluge gives under *Pfaffe* is no proof at all of Greek influence in the German Church. Greek *παῖς* is first mentioned in the fourth Œcumenical Council (A. D. 451);<sup>12</sup> in the following centuries it occurs in the plural form *papades* in the Roman church and not before we reach the twelfth or the thirteenth century does *papa* become general in the sense of *clericus*.<sup>13</sup> As this word is not found in books of prayer or ritual, it is natural that it should become the full possession of the people in a true Germanic form. Precisely the same is to be said of *parrochia*<sup>14</sup> which being also a Greek word be-

<sup>12</sup> E. A. Sophocles, *Greek Lexicon of the Roman and Byzantine Periods*. He gives also *παππᾶς* as an equivalent for *παππᾶς*; and since a corresponding word for *clericus* does not occur in the Romance languages, the possibility of *Pfaffe* being merely a popular form of *Papst* is not excluded.

<sup>13</sup> To judge from Du Cange, the word was first introduced into the Roman church by pope Zacharias who was by birth a Greek (eighth century). The nearest examples following this first quotation are all from bulls and chartularies of the time of Innocent III (end of twelfth century).

<sup>14</sup> Du Cange gives *parofia* as a variation for Middle Latin *parochia*, and we find this in the form *parafia* as the common word for parish in Polish, and *paropi parofia parrofia parofi parofi perofia* in the Provençal dialects (Mistral). No

came Latinized at a relatively late time; not being found in the Bible and the prayerbook there was nothing in its way of becoming naturalized. Kluge objects to the loss of the last syllable, but such losses are not rare in German.

So it is by no means strange that *Teppich* should show no sound changes although it is found already in the O.H.G. period. Yet it would have been but fair for Kluge to quote Lexer *in toto* and not to avoid forms which would work against his pet theory of precisely locating the borrowing of a word. Now we find the forms *tepit teppit teppet tept tepich teppich tepech tepech tepch deppich tebach tewich töppich teppit tapit tapet tapeiz* and last not least *zeppet*.<sup>15</sup> So after all a partial sound change occurs, and Kluge would be compelled to place the origin of the word before the seventh instead of into the eighth century. But it is really immaterial what the form of the word is, for the different approximations found in M.H.G. are precisely what we should expect without being driven to as many new derivations as there are forms.

The Germans are supposed to have borrowed a number of architectural terms from the Romans, and if there is any structural form with which the Germans were acquainted earlier than any other it is certainly the tower, the Lat. *turris*. And yet this word has persisted as *turri, turra* in O.H.G., *turm, turn* in M.H.G. and Mod.H.G. What is Kluge to do with this obstinacy? He simply passes it over in silence. As a matter of course, the Latin word stayed with them as an ever present reminder of Roman power and is no doubt as old as *Tiegel, Pfahl* and *Pfosten*.

doubt *parofia* existed in M.H.G. and it is this form that must have given rise to M.H.G. *pharrhof* (see Lexer, *pharrhof*) in which there is an attempt at popular etymology and which means no more and no less than merely *pfarre*. Now *pfarre* must naturally result out of this combination. This becomes more probable when we consider the other popular etymology *pharreherre* for *pharraere* by the side of it: "ausdeutend entstellt aus *pharraere*, Wack." (Lexer).

<sup>15</sup> Here are a few more examples from Lexer: *panzier panzer* . . . im 16. jh. bei Erasm. Alberus auch lautverschoben *pfanzer*; *pär par* . . . *phar*; *patene paten phatene phaten*; *phakte phakt, md. phacht pacht phät pacht*; *phlanzen planzen(!)*; *pläge pfläge pflöge*; *tambär tambäre tanbär tabär tapär t. mbur tamber zambär(!)*; *timit dimit zimt*. We certainly could not regard *zambär*, from French *tambour* as introduced before the seventh century.

The tendency of ascribing culture and cultivation of plants to Rome, I am afraid, has gone too far. De Candolle shows conclusively that certain kinds of plums<sup>16</sup> are indigenous to the central European plain, and that the cherry<sup>17</sup> and the pear<sup>18</sup> had been cultivated in Germany from time immemorial. We should not assume a Roman origin except where it can be proved historically that the first importation came from Italy. A coincidence of sounds with the serviceable second sound shifting can at best be only adduced as a proof of common possession.<sup>19</sup>

Although *Pfirsich* exhibits the permutations completely it is very doubtful whether it was known in Germany before the M.H.G. period, and its absence from O.H.G. is not at all so strange. The earliest example in Littré under *pêche* is of the thirteenth century and the English *peach* shows that it is a late French importation. *Rettig*, according to Kluge, comes directly from Latin *radicem* before the O.H.G. period on account of its final guttural. As a matter of fact *radix* received the particular meaning of *raphanus* on French soil, as *raditz rais*, etc., in Provençal and *radis* in French indicate, hence it is more likely that the radish became known as an edible root from France. Altogether French importations have been placed by several centuries too late, and many of the southern fruits were more likely introduced from France, such as the fig, the peach.<sup>20</sup>

The Spanish boot of the second sound shifting has been rigorously applied by Kluge to the ending of words and with disastrous results. When a foreign word is introduced into the native language with a different sound

system, the tendency will be to so transform it as to give it a native appearance. The sound mutation is a powerful agent in this direction, but it affects only the first part of the word which in German corresponds to the accented root syllable of the word.<sup>21</sup> In the following unaccented syllables the sound mutation according to the strict law does not always produce the desired effect, and more convenient transformations which follow the law of least resistance take place. Strange syllables receive the native garb, and dialectically *patata* becomes *Putak*,<sup>22</sup> *Appetit* *Apetik*<sup>23</sup> and *Tabak* *Töbich*.<sup>24</sup> The more a word becomes the possession of the people at large the greater the change must be if it departs too much from the native form.

For the change of endings native syllabic combinations must be kept in mind. The M.H.G. and Mod.H.G. *-ig-ich* (*ch* after liquids) is a syllable of least resistance, and foreign *-ic -it -ec -et -ac -at -j* etc., are liable to take this ending, hence such forms as *Rettig Pfirsich Essig Mönch Kelch Teppich predigen Käfig*.<sup>25</sup>

Unusual combinations may be transformed. The change of *turr* to *Turm* (: *Sturm, Wurm*) is such an instance. Frequently all the changes combined are not sufficient to produce the desired result, and then popular etymology comes into play and still further transforms the combination. Such attempts are seen for example in M.H.G. *pforzich* which we find as *phorzeich vörzich forzaichen furzog*.

When we deal with loan-words in modern German, all these facts must be considered. Besides, as often is the case, peculiar dialectic forms may survive, and it is not necessary to resort to the second sound shifting to locate the word. Phonetic studies are not the end of etymological investigation of these words but merely an assistance in the chronological data of sources. Loan-words must mainly be stud-

<sup>16</sup> Alph. de Candolle, *Origine des Plantes Cultivées*, p. 170.

<sup>17</sup> *Ibid.* p. 165.

<sup>18</sup> *Ibid.* p. 183.

<sup>19</sup> Even if the word be taken from Latin there is not sufficient ground to assume an importation of the plant from Rome. The horseradish is known throughout Germany as *Meerrettig*, but in some parts of Austria the Slavic form *Kren* has survived. This in itself is not a proof that the plant has been imported from Russia.

<sup>20</sup> It will be noticed that *Feige, Dattel, Zwiebel* resemble much more the French words *figue, datte* (Italian *dattilo*), *ciboule* than Latin *ficus, dactylus, caepulla*. The latter would have given quite different results.

<sup>21</sup> Hence generally the accent is drawn back to the first syllable.

<sup>22</sup> Kluge, *Etym. Dictionary* sub *Kartoffel*.

<sup>23</sup> Winteler, *Die Kerenzer Mundart*, p. 56.

<sup>24</sup> Weinhold, *Ueber deutsche Dialektforschung*, p. 85.

<sup>25</sup> Other M.H.G. words are: *prisilic* for *prisilje*, 'brasilienholz,' *bederich* for *phetaraere* 'petraria;' *phorzich* *phorzeich*, 'porticus.'

ied historically and the second sound shifting must not be juggled with.

LEO WIENER.

Missouri State University.

JUBINAL'S "ÉVANGILE AUX FEMMES."

IN 1835 Achille Jubinal published a book entitled: *Jongleurs et Trouvères, ou Choix de Saluts, Épitres, Réveries et autres pièces légères des XIIIe et XIVe siècles*. Among the poems here published was the "Évangile aux Femmes" (pp. 26-33), which was known to him to exist in three MSS. of the Bibliothèque Nationale at Paris. In the following pages will be noticed the manner in which he used these three MSS.: A, B and C, in the constitution of his text.

A contains thirty-three quatrains, B sixteen quatrains, and C thirty-two quatrains. The text of A he disregarded almost altogether, leaving twelve of its quatrains unpublished, and made C the basis of his text, though pretending to follow the others (at least in regard to the order of quatrains).

Since the quatrains occur in a different order in each of the MSS., the editor chose to follow in the main the order of C; but as he considered B to have the best text, he followed B's text whenever a quatrain was contained in B. When he came near the end of the poem he noticed that several quatrains which occur in B are not to be found in C, so he inserted these quatrains here and there among those of C. He seems to have made use of A only eight times: the first time by putting the first quatrain of A in place of the third quatrain of C to which it corresponds; five times by substituting a word from A which seemed to make better sense; and twice by giving in a footnote a quatrain not found in either of the other two MSS.

A point to be noted in regard to his use of A is that in five cases he gives a quatrain as occurring in C alone (which he always indicates by an asterisk), whereas it really does occur in A also, although wanting in B. His slighting of A is probably due to the fact of its greater age which made its decipherment more difficult for him.

I have examined Jubinal's text in the light thrown on it by copies of MSS. A and B, and by a part copy, part collation (of Constans' text, *Marie de Compiègne*, 1876) of MS. C. The following is a tabulated statement of the chief results:

Jubinal's Sources.

- J<sup>1</sup> = C<sup>1</sup> (AB wanting),
- J<sup>2</sup> = C<sup>2</sup>, putting verse 2 last (AB wanting),
- J<sup>3</sup> = A<sup>1</sup> (C<sup>3</sup>, B<sup>1</sup>),
- J<sup>4</sup> = B<sup>2</sup>, except *traient* from A<sup>2</sup> (C<sup>5</sup>, B<sup>1</sup>),
- J<sup>5</sup> = B<sup>3</sup> (C<sup>4</sup>, A<sup>3</sup>),
- J<sup>6</sup> = C<sup>6</sup> (AB wanting),
- J<sup>7</sup> = C<sup>7</sup> (AB wanting),
- J<sup>8</sup> = C<sup>8</sup> (A<sup>8</sup>, B<sup>8</sup> are somewhat similar),
- J<sup>9</sup> = C<sup>9</sup> (AB wanting),
- J<sup>10</sup> = C<sup>10</sup> (A<sup>30</sup>, B wanting; marked by Jubinal as occurring in C alone),
- J<sup>11</sup> = C<sup>11</sup> (AB wanting),
- J<sup>12</sup> = B<sup>4</sup> (C<sup>12</sup>, A<sup>4</sup>),
- J<sup>13</sup> = C<sup>13</sup> (A<sup>16</sup>, B wanting; marked by Jubinal as occurring in C alone),
- J<sup>14</sup> = B<sup>5</sup>, except verse 3 from C<sup>14</sup> (C<sup>14</sup>, A<sup>5</sup>),
- J<sup>15</sup> = B<sup>6</sup>, except *cuer* from C<sup>15</sup> (C<sup>15</sup>, A<sup>6</sup>),
- J<sup>16</sup> = B<sup>7</sup>, except *apareille, ausi, pourvoit, c'on, com*, which in spelling follow A<sup>7</sup> (C<sup>16</sup>, A<sup>7</sup>),
- J<sup>17</sup> = C<sup>17</sup> (AB wanting),
- J<sup>18</sup> = C<sup>18</sup> (A<sup>29</sup>, B wanting; verse 1 much changed by Jubinal; marked by him as occurring in C alone),
- J<sup>19</sup> = C<sup>19</sup> (AB wanting),
- J<sup>20</sup> = C<sup>20</sup> (AB wanting),
- J<sup>21</sup> = C<sup>21</sup> (A<sup>32</sup>, B wanting; marked by Jubinal as occurring in C alone),
- J<sup>22</sup> = B<sup>10</sup> (C<sup>22</sup>, A<sup>10</sup>),
- J<sup>23</sup> = C<sup>23</sup> (A<sup>11</sup>, B wanting; marked by Jubinal as occurring in C alone),
- J<sup>24</sup> = B<sup>11</sup> (C<sup>24</sup>, A<sup>12</sup>),
- J<sup>25</sup> = B<sup>12</sup> (C<sup>25</sup> and A<sup>15</sup> are similar),
- J<sup>26</sup> = B<sup>8</sup> (A<sup>8</sup> and C<sup>8</sup> are similar),
- J<sup>27</sup> = B<sup>9</sup> (C wanting, A<sup>9</sup>),
- J<sup>28</sup> = C<sup>26</sup> (B wanting; A<sup>13</sup> and A<sup>15</sup> are similar),
- J<sup>29</sup> = C<sup>27</sup> (AB wanting),
- J<sup>30</sup> = C<sup>28</sup> (AB wanting),
- J<sup>31</sup> = B<sup>13</sup> (C wanting, A<sup>14</sup>),
- J<sup>32</sup> = B<sup>14</sup> (C wanting, A<sup>17</sup>),
- J<sup>33</sup> = C<sup>29</sup> (AB wanting),
- J<sup>34</sup> = C<sup>30</sup> (AB wanting),
- J<sup>35</sup> = C<sup>31</sup> (AB wanting),



J<sup>36</sup>=B<sup>15</sup> (CA wanting),

J<sup>37</sup>=B<sup>16</sup> (A wanting; C<sup>32</sup>, last two verses are similar and are given in a foot-note by Jubinal).

Added at the end in a note are:

J<sup>38</sup>=A<sup>26</sup> (CB wanting),

J<sup>39</sup>=A<sup>28</sup> (CB wanting).

GEORGE C. KEIDEL.

Johns Hopkins University.

#### THE EARLIEST USE OF THE WORD GEOLOGY.

ANENT the recent inquiry in *Notes and Queries*, Sep. 29, 1894 (see also *id.*, Nov. 24) for the first use of the word *geology*, attention should be directed to the supposed coinage of *geologia* by Richard de Bury.

The passage of the *Philobiblon* in which *geologia* occurs closes the eleventh chapter, which tells "Why we have preferred the books of the Liberal Arts before the books of Law." The argument is thus summed up:

"From these things it is sufficiently clear that as laws are neither arts nor sciences, so the books of law cannot properly be called books of art or science; nor is this faculty to which we give, by an appropriate term, the name *geology*, or the science of earthly things, to be reckoned among the sciences." [*nec est haec facultas inter scientias recensenda, quam licet geologiam appropriato vocabulo nominare.*]

This translation of the passage is taken from the admirable edition of the *Philobiblon* prepared by Professor A. F. West and published by the Grolier Club (New York, 1889).

It is only necessary to add Professor West's comments upon this occurrence of the word *geologia*:

Part iii, p. 30: "De Bury's Greek was slight enough. Greek words are 'exotic' to him, and he handles them delicately. They are not infrequent, however, in his book. He coins *geologia* correctly and *Philobiblon* awkwardly."

Part iii, p. 127: "De Bury coins *geologia*, 'the science of earthly things,' as the appropriate name for law, in antithesis to the sciences which aid in the understanding of divine things—comprehensively speaking, *theologia*."

*Transactions of the Am. Phil. Soc.*, vol. xxii (1891), p. 96: *geologia*.—"The only instance, I suppose, in Latin, previous to modern times. It is coined by De Bury."

JAMES W. BRIGHT.

#### BARLAAM AND JOASAPH IN SPAIN.

THE following contribution is intended to be an addition to: Ernst Kuhn, *Barlaam und Joasaph*, Eine bibliographisch-literarisch-schichtliche Studie. (München, 1893).<sup>1</sup>

I have not exhausted the subject; many works yet to be inspected may contain additional matter.

Kuhn in his work gives:

I Spanish translations of the story:

p. 66. 1. Juan de Arce Solorzano, 1608.

2. Baltasar de Santa Cruz. 1692.

II. Spanish shortened versions of the story:

1. Estoria, ed Lauchert (According to Vincentius Bellovacensis).

p. 67. 2. Ribadeneira, Flos Sanctorum.<sup>2</sup>

III. Literary productions bearing the name of B. and J.:

1. Lope de Vega, Barlan y Josafá.

IV. Literary productions containing the story, but not bearing the name of B. and J.: None mentioned.

V. Spanish versions of the Parables of B. and J.:

A. Of the Parables found in the current text:

p. 74, note. a. Die "Geschichte" (N. B. no real Parable) "von dem Ratgeber des Königs" in Conde Lucanor.<sup>3</sup>

1. "Der Mann im Brunnen":

p. 76. a. Libro de los Gatos, Cap. 48.<sup>4</sup>

2. "Die drei Freunde":

p. 77. a. Castigos é Documentos del Rey Don Sancho.<sup>5</sup>

b. Conde Lucanor.<sup>6</sup>

c. Historia del Cavallero Cifar, cap. v.<sup>7</sup>

B. Of the additional parables found in the Hebrew version of Ibn Chisdai:<sup>8</sup>

<sup>1</sup> *Abh. der k. bayer. Akad. d. Wiss.* I. Cl., xx. Bd., I. Abth.

<sup>2</sup> The author remarks, after speaking of Ribadeneira "Einen in Buenos Aires gedruckten Spanischen Text sah Kírpičnikov in Paris." I am unable to make out whether this is a complete translation, or a reprint of Rib.

<sup>3</sup> *Riv. Col. Aut. Esp.* vol. li., p. 369.

<sup>4</sup> *Riv. LI.* p. 557. Oesterley (*Jahrb.*, ix, 126,) proves that the L. d. I. G. is a translation of Odo of Ciringtonia.

<sup>5</sup> *Riv. LI.*, p. 157.

<sup>6</sup> *Riv. LI.*, p. 418.

<sup>7</sup> Add: of the first Part, p. 21. Ed. Stutg. Lit. Verein.

<sup>8</sup> *Vide* Kuhn, p. 44, note; p. 43. Cap. xxiv, xxvii.

p. 82.—I. "Die beiden einander vergiftenden Strolchen" in:

- a. *Leyendas Moriscas*, Ed. F. Guillén Robles, I, 173-177.

In the works quoted by Kuhn we find:

I. Spanish Translations of the story:

The *Bulletin de l'Acad. d. Sciences de St. Pétersb.*, Cl. hist.-philol., ix (1852), nos. 20, 21, p. 308 (Kuhn, p. 51, c), quoted and referred to by Cosquin, (Kuhn, p. 4) says: "Unmittelbar aus dem Lateinischen ging sie in das Spanische, gegen Ende des 15. Jahrh. in's Böhmische . . . über."

Does this mean that before the end of the fifteenth Century it was translated into Spanish? If so, no other reference has fallen under my notice, since the text of the library of the Royal Palace at Madrid (see below) is not a translation.<sup>9</sup>

II. Kuhn (p. 55) says:

"Abkürzungen liegen u. a. vor: a. in des Vincentius Bellovacensis *Speculum historiale*, Lib. xv, cap. 1-64. b. in der *Legenda Aurea* oder *Historia Lombardica* des Jacobus de Voragine, cap. 175."

Of the *Legenda Aurea* we find the following Spanish translations:

1. MS. in two vols. folio, Bibl. Nac. B.B., 58-59.

2. MS. in one vol. folio, Bibl. Nac. Q. 2.

Don Antonio Sanchez Moguel (*Mágico Prodigioso*, Madr. 1881, p. 62, says about 1:

"letra del siglo xv, copia de más antiguo texto, á juzgar por su lenguaje, de fines del xiii. ó principios del xiv."

I have compared both 1 and 2 with Bibl. Nac. E. E. 23. (Sanch. Mog., l. c., p. 64), which MS., its oldest *Legenda Aurea*, the Catalogue mentions as "Saec. xiii," and I find them to be literal translations of the Latin MS. Our saints are found in B.B. 59, fol. ccxix, 10-ccxxvi, 10.

A Catalan translation of the *Leg. Aur.* is

9 Kuhn (p. 54), "um nur einige zu erwähnen," sums up a number of MSS. of the mediaeval Latin translation ascribed (*vid.* p. 53) to Georgius Trapezuntius.

For Spain may be mentioned:

MS. F. 152 of the Madrid Bibl. Nac., xii. cent. (*vid.* A de los Rios, iii, 285, note; F. Wolf, in *Jahrb.* vi, 62, note) which contains, together with a number of works, apparently of French origin, on fol. 124-136: "Vita Beatorum B. and J."

found in the Paris Bibl. Nat. MS. Esp., No. 44.<sup>10</sup>

V. Spanish versions of the Parables. Besides those given by Kuhn, we find in the works quoted by him:

1. "Die erste Doppel parabel von der Todes-trompete und den vier Kästchen":

a. Libro de los Enxemplos, 121,<sup>11</sup> (Oesterley, *Gesta Rom.*, 143).

b. Libro de los Enx., 223,<sup>12</sup> (Oesterley, *ibid.*, 143).

c. Timoneda, Alivio<sup>13</sup> (Oesterley, *ibid.*, 251; Brauholtz, *Die erste nicht-christl. Parabel des B. u. J.* p. 53).

2. "Mann und Vogel":

a. Libro de los Enx, 53<sup>14</sup> (Oesterley, 167)

3. "Mann im Brunnen":

Nothing additional, because Knust (*Jahrb.*, vi. 37) refers us to the Spanish translation of *Calila é Dymna*,<sup>15</sup> which we can leave out of consideration.<sup>16</sup>

4. "Drei Freunde":

Oesterley (129) refers to Petrus Alphonsus ii, 8; *Espejo de Leyos* (*sic*) 9 and *Ysopo* of 1644, fo 152.

As all these are translations,<sup>17</sup> if they occur in Spanish (I do not know of a Spanish translation of the *Disc. Cler.*), they may be left out of consideration.

5. "Jahreskönig."

Oesterley (74) adds:

a. Libro de los Enx., 339;<sup>18</sup> and (224):

b. Conde Lucanor, 49.<sup>19</sup>

<sup>10</sup> Morel Fatio, in *Grundriss der romanischen Philologie*, ii, 2, p. 91, 101.

<sup>11</sup> Riv. LI, p. 476.

<sup>12</sup> Riv. LI, p. 502.

<sup>13</sup> Riv. vol. iii, p. 173. Repeated almost verbatim in Julian de Medrano, *Silva Curiosa*, Paris, 1608, p. 145. For a collation of the two works see later in MOD. LANG. NOTES.

<sup>14</sup> Riv. LI, p. 460. Like many stories in the *L. d. I. Enx.* it begins: "Dijo Pedro Alfonso a su hijo." In fact, this version is nearer to the *Disciplina Clericalis* than to B. and J.

<sup>15</sup> Riv. LI, p. 18-19.

<sup>16</sup> Landau, *Quellen des Dekameron*<sup>2</sup>, p. 222, mentions *Leg. Aur.*, cap. 117. The Spanish translation has already been mentioned (col. 23).

<sup>17</sup> Gayangos, in Riv. LI, p. 445; Morel Fatio, in *Romania*, Oct. 1894.

<sup>18</sup> P. 529.

<sup>19</sup> P. 420.

- c. Libro de los Enx., 310.<sup>20</sup>  
6 "Die Liebe zu den Frauen."

D'Ancona, in *Romania*, iii, 168, mentions:

- a. Libro de los Enx., 231.<sup>21</sup>

This is all that can be gathered from Kuhn. I shall add the following:

- I. a. Of MS. translations: in Portuguese, that mentioned by C. Michaelis de Vasconcellos in *Grundriss*, ii, 2 p. 212.  
I. b. Of printed translations:  
1. La vida de Sant Josafat, en lingua Catalana, Comp. por Francisco Alegre. Barcelona, 1494.<sup>22</sup>  
2. The translation of 1608 has for complete title:

Historia | de los dos | soldados de | Christo, Barlaan, y Josafat. | Escrita por san Juan Damasceno, Doctor de | la Yglesia Griega. | Dirigida al illustrissimo y Reuerendissimo don Fr. | Diego de Mardones, Obispo de Cordoua | Confessor de su Magestad, y de su Consejo, &c., mi señor. | En Madrid | En la Imprenta Real M. DC. viii. (small 8<sup>o</sup>. 24 unnumbered pp. of prelim. + 215 fos. text; ends 215, r<sup>o</sup>; v<sup>o</sup>: En Madrid, por Iuan Flamenco. | MDCVIII | Aprob. Sept. 20, 1603. Privil. Feb. 21, 1604. Tassa Mar. 30, 1608.)

In the "Al Letor" the author says:

"Esta tan enriquezida la lengua Latina con las traduciones de la Griega, y las vulgares estrangeras con las de la Latina, que me parecio injusta cosa, que la Española nuestra, siendo tan süaue, copiosa, y no menos elegante, careciesse desta historia."

And later on: "that he made the translation at the age of sixteen," an age at which few Spaniards of that time were able to translate from Greek MSS. The language of this translation is so refreshingly smooth, compared with other works of the same author (*Tragedias de Amor*, Madrid 1607; *Juan de la Cuesta*) that it might be supposed to be directly from the Greek; a comparison with Liebrecht,<sup>23</sup> who points out the differences between the Greek and the version of Billius, shows that the latter was de Arce's original.

<sup>20</sup> P. 521.

<sup>21</sup> P. 504.

<sup>22</sup> Gallardo, *Ensayo de una Biblioteca Espanola*, vol. ii col. 541, no. 3962 of the extract from the Catalogue of Fernando Colón. (Not mentioned by Morel Fatio, *Grundr.*, ii, 2, 91-92). Alegre is mentioned as translator of other works, *Grundr.* ii, 2, 116.

<sup>23</sup> *Vid.* Kuhn, p. 50.

3. In the wretched translation of Fr. Baltasar de Sancta Cruz we find, at the end of the "prologo del traductor al lector":

"Ya a los ultimos pliegos de la impresion llevo a mis manos esta misma traduccion impresa en 'Cordoua' por los Años de mill seiscientos y diez y ocho, dedicada al Illustrissimo Señor Obispo de aquella ciudad D. F. Diego Mardones."

This edition, portending to be a reprint of Madrid, 1608, does not exist; Fr. Baltasar's memory was at fault.

#### II. Shortened versions of the story.

a. A. Morel Fatio (*Romania*, x, p. 300, note) gives a full and correct description of MS. Royal Palace, Madrid, marked 2-G-7 (Old vii-D-5), and having on the back the title: *Leyes de Palencia*. Fol. 300 v<sup>o</sup>. has: *Esriptus fuit anno Domini MCCCCLXX Petrus Ortis*.

The story of B. and J. is found fol. 95-213. From the extracts to be given it will be seen that the author had his own peculiar way of translating. The shortening consists of leaving out part of the wearisome expositions of the Christain faith.

b. Of printed *Flos Sanctorum* in Spanish we find the following:

1. *Legenda seu flos sanctorum in lingua hispanica*. Toledo, 1511.<sup>24</sup>

2. *Flos Sanctorum*, impresso en Zaragoza, año de 1556.<sup>25</sup>

3. *Flos Sanctorum* . . . . Ahora de nuevo corregido . . por . . Dr. Gonzalo Millan . . En Sevilla . . 1572.<sup>26</sup>

4. <sup>27</sup>La Hagiogra- | phia y vidas de los Sanctos de el nuevo | Testamento | . . . . Por el Doctor | Joan Basilio Sanctoro. | . . Bilbao, Mathias Mares, 1580.

The *Censura* is dated Febr. 17, 1576.

<sup>24</sup> Catalogue of Colón, no. 2158, in Gallardo, ii, 519.

<sup>25</sup> In *Index Libr. Prohib.*, 1583.

<sup>26</sup> Gallardo, iv, 961, who shows from the work that it was originally written by Fr. Pedro de la Vega, and finished in 1521. (In the Fernandez Guerra Collection).

<sup>27</sup> From this point forward, I no longer refer to Sanchez Moguel, (l. c.) because his statements are incorrect. Of Villegas, the first volume is set down as the complete work: the fifth part, of 1589, is impossible; the differences between early and late Ribadeneyra publications are not indicated; Santoro and Ortiz Lucio are misleading as given, in fact hardly a word is correct. Of Villegas I have not found in San Isidro the third part (Toledo, Juan Rodriguez, 1579,) as given: by S. Moguel, p. 164.



Bibl. S. Isidro, 35-4, no. 9698.

The title does not indicate that the work ends, fol. 454, v<sup>o</sup>, with June 30 and: Fin de la Primera Parte.

The *Tabla* does not mention Barlaam; Josaphat is given: Josaphat Rey 27 de Nouiembre. The continuation is not found in S. Isidro.

The "Primera Parte del Flos Sanctorum y vidas de los Santos del Yermo del Nuevo Testamento, por el Dr. I. B. S., Bilbao, 1604," found in said library, ends: "Fin de la Segunda parte," but is the same half redivided into three-monthly parts.

5. Alonso de Villegas.<sup>28</sup>

Salva<sup>29</sup> says:

"De cuán distinto modo pensaba y escribía Villégas en 1554, de lo que pensaba y escribía veinticuatro años más tarde cuando principió á publicar su Flos Sanctorum!"

This gives us 1578 for the date of the first part. The titles of the parts are as follows:

First. Flos Sanctorum y Historia General de la vida y hechos de Iesu Christo . . . y de todos los Santos . . . conforme al breuiario Romano . . . con las vidas de los Santos propios de España, y de otros Extrauagantes . . . En Madrid por Pedro Madrigal: Año M. D. XCIII.

Second. Flos Sanctorum. Segunda Parte y Historia General en que se escriue la vida de la Virgen . . . Tratase de las seys edades del mundo, etc.

[On pp. 215-225, after the building of the Temple and before the life of Joshua, we find: cap. iii en que se escriue el origen de las ordenes militares.]

Third: Flos S. Tercera Parte. Toledo, Juan y Pedro Rodriguez, 1589, contains lives and anecdotes of an endless number of abbots and monks; but nothing about B. and J.

Fourth. Flos S. Cuarta y Ultima Parte, y discursos o sermones sobre los Evangelios de todas las Dominicales del año . . . Madrid, Pedro Madrigal, 1593. (At the end: En Cuenca en casa de Juan Masselin. 1592.)

Fifth. Fructus S. y quinta parte del Flos S. que es libro de exemplos, assi de hombres ilustres en santidad, como de otros cuyos hechos fueron dignos de reprehension y cas-

<sup>28</sup> F. Wolf in *Wiener Jahrbücher der Literatur*, cxxii, 119 (see Ticknor, transl. by Julius, ii 695) is not accessible to me.

<sup>29</sup> *Catálogo*, 1872, vol. 1, no. 1497, describing the original edition (Toledo, 1534) of the *Comedia Selvagia*.

tigo . . . colegido de historias divinas y humanas. Cuenca, Juan Masselin, 1594.<sup>30</sup>

Touching B. and J. we find: Vol. i. fol. 529, r<sup>o</sup>—sqq: Barlaam, y Josafat, confesores.

The whole story is given quite fully, but without any vestige of the parables.

Fol v.—This being the most interesting vol. of the whole work I shall describe it somewhat at length, according to a copy in my possession.

On reverse of the title page: extract from Fray Juan de Marieta, *Hist. Ecclesiast. de Esp.*, lib. 20, cap. 70 about the author, containing a list of his works up to 1594, that is, the five parts of F. S. and the life of S. Isidro.

Priv. March 19, 1592; Tassa Dec. 3, 1593; Erratas of work and of Adicion; Portrait of "Alfonsus de Villegas, Tolet, Theol, Vitarum Sanctorum Scriptor, Anni Agens 49," below which comes the remark "Al Lector" that as his *Flos* was being freely reprinted, he had this Portrait made to put it as a signature and mark of authenticity in his own issues. Fol. 2, v<sup>o</sup>-4, r<sup>o</sup>: Prologo al Lector, contains:

"Oso decir, que . . . seria possible aprovecharse mas deste solo, que de las quarto partes que hize del Fl. S., aunque . . . entiendo que han sido muchos aprovechados de aquella lectura: y esto por ser todo de exemplos . . ."

He quotes as follows from a letter of Fr. Luis de Granada, Lisb. 29 Oct. 1588:

"Seria de mucho provecho un libro de exemplos, conforme a otro que anda en Latin, sacado de diversos autores . . . seria una Silva de varia leccion—"

which remark induced him to write this *Fructus*. The work is divided into seventy-eight *Discursos*, arranged alphabetically according to subjects, each introduced by a short exhortation, then follow examples from the Bible, ending: "Hasta aqui es de la divina Escritura;" thereafter examples from religious works and christian history, and winding up with "exemplos estrangeros" from classical literature and an occasional recent event.

<sup>30</sup> The set: *Bibl. San Isidro*, 141-2, nos. 49882-86. The sixth part I find mentioned only in *Coleccion de Libros Espanoles Raros ó Curiosos* vol. v (Reprint of the *Comedia Selvagia*), Advertencia Preliminar, iv, note. It was finished before 1600.

A great number (169) of the examples are drawn from a book called *Promptuario de Exemplos* or *Guido de exemplis*, which he frequently calls classical, stating that "Guido a tiempos se precia de Vizcayno," and calling him "Guido Bituricense." Guido's book must have been divided into at least three books (131, r<sup>o</sup>), and arranged under headings (430, v<sup>o</sup> he quotes "Prompt. verbo prelati, numero 123").

Furthermore, he mentions (48, r<sup>o</sup>): "Un libro llamado Espejo de exemplos," and (158, r<sup>o</sup>) "un libro de mano de exemplos." A number of these stories also occur in the already quoted *Libro de los Exemplos* published by Gayangos<sup>31</sup> and Morel Fatio,<sup>32</sup> but in very different versions.

The author makes the following remark about his personality (60, r<sup>o</sup>, of addition<sup>33</sup>): "Bernardino de Sandoval, maestrescuela de Toledo, me dio grados de Filosofia y de Teologia." He speaks very feelingly (384, r<sup>o</sup>-v<sup>o</sup>): of the pious prayers of his mother, who even when a widow of seventy years worked silk at her loom as she had done when young and "de mediano estado."

"Una heredad mia de arboleda y cepas bien cerca de la ciudad, en el camino que dizen de Loeches (384, v<sup>o</sup>)," when threatened by locusts, had been kept free by an *agnus dei* which he tied to a tree, "el proprio dia que escrivo esto, que es Domingo diez y seys dias de Junio deste año de mil y quinientos y nouenta y uno."—"Al tiempo que esto se escriue, que es año de 1592." (15, of the first part).

B. and J. are mentioned after San Juan Demasceno: 205, r<sup>o</sup>; 327, r<sup>o</sup>; 335, r<sup>o</sup>; each mention being of only a few lines.

The parable of the love for women, after the *Promptuario*, in two versions, occurs on fol. 335, v<sup>o</sup>.

6. Pedro de Ribadeneyra.

All that can be gathered from Brunet, Graesse, Ebert, Pérennès<sup>34</sup> is dates; Vicente

<sup>31</sup> Riv. vol. LI.

<sup>32</sup> *Romania*, vol. vii; see *Grundr.*, ii, 2, 95.

<sup>33</sup> After fo. 438, a new foliation 1-60 begins.

<sup>34</sup> *Dict. de Bibliogr. Cathol.* (in Migne, Troisième et dernière encyclopédie théologique).

Lafuente<sup>35</sup> also gives some, but states that vol. i of the *Obras* (1605), has for its contents: El Flos Sanctorum ó Libro de las Vidas de los Santos de quienes reza la Iglesia Romana todo el año, y los Santos Extrauagantes, en un cuerpo.

The fact is that vol. ii of 1601, the only one I have been able to see, contains the Saints for the last six months of the year, together with the life of Ignacio de Loyola. B. and J. are not even mentioned here. The edition of 1616 has in the first volume the saints for the whole year, while the second bears the title: "Segunda Parte del F. S. . . En laqual se contienen las vidas demuchos Santos de todos estados, que comunmente llaman Extrauagantes," and contains, besides, the life of Ign. de Loyola. I have not seen vol. i of the *Obras* (1605); vol. ii of 1616 may be a reprint thereof, but has *Licencia*, Feb. 24, 1608; *Privil.* May 1, 1608; *Tassa*, Jan. 29, 1609.

B. and J. are given fo. 481 et seq.; the story is slightly more condensed than in Villegas, but contains the parable about the love of women.<sup>36</sup>

III. Literary works bearing the name of B. and J., or of J. alone. I will add from Barrera's Catalogue:<sup>37</sup>

1. Benjamin de la Iglesia y mártir San Josafat (p. 531).

2. Los defensores de Cristo (Barlaan y Josafá, p. 540).

Authors: *Tres Ingenios*—in the volume, Valencia 1646, described by Barr. p. 708, belonging to the University of Bologna.

3. Dos Luceros de Oriente: Barlaan y Josafá (p. 544).

<sup>35</sup> Page xvii of his introduction to R.'s select works, Riv vol LX).

<sup>36</sup> The *Compendio de Vidas de Santos*, por Fr. Francisco Ortiz Lucio, Madrid 1597 (Aprov. Nov. 2, 1595) has not a word about B. and J. Neither do we find their names in Cayrasco's *Templo Militante y Flos S.*, 4 parts, 2 vols.; Lisb., Pedro Crasbeeck, 1613-14. His comical verse (*vid. Sanch. Mog.*, l, c., p. 68-70) might have relieved the monotony of these notes.

<sup>37</sup> Barrera frequently puts down a title without mentioning his authority. The same thing happens in Mesonero Romanos' lists, so that the matter remains as obscure as before. It is to be hoped that in the new edition of Barrera this great inconvenience will be remedied.

4. Prodigio de la India, San Josafat<sup>38</sup> (p. 575).

IV. Literary productions containing the story, but not bearing the name of B. and J.<sup>39</sup>

1. Many titles in Barrera's list will lead a person who is occupied with the B. and J. to suspect that they belong to a version of our story. Most of the plays, however, are not to be found; the only one I have succeeded in

Josaphat.  
Abenir su Padre Barba.  
Barachias Galan.  
Teudas Barba.  
Rossa su hixa.  
Fenissa su criada.  
Zardan.  
Pimienta gracioso.  
Un Criado.

At the top of the page as given, there is in more modern handwriting: Barlaam+y Josafat.

The names of the authors, *los Licenciados*, etc. (as in Barrera), are added above the *Personas* by the same hand that wrote the "Barlaam+y Josafat," and in the original hand at the end of the list. Unfortunately the play is not remarkable. A passage that is slightly better than the rest will be given in a future number of MOD. LANG. NOTES.

V. Spanish versions of the Parables. We may add here:

a. The "Geschichte" (as Kuhn calls it) of the adviser of the King which occurs also in

1. Libro de los Enx. 4<sup>40</sup>

<sup>38</sup> On p. xxxii, in Riv. LII (vol. iv of Lope's Selected Works) this play is claimed for Lope by J. R. Chorley, on the authority of Mesonero Romanos (Riv. XLV, vol. ii of *Dramat. Contemp. á Lope*, p. xlix; and Riv. XLIX; vol. ii of *Dramat. posteriores á Lope*, p. xlv).

<sup>39</sup> Amador de los Rios (vol. iv, p. 260, note 2) compares D. Juan Manuel's *Libro de los Estados* with the poem of Perceval. Ferdinand Wolf (*Jahrb.* vol. vi, p. 84, note 2) says: "viel näher liegt der Vergleich mit Barlaam und Josaphat." D. M. Menéndez y Pelayo (*España Moderna*, March 1894, p. 130) says: "D. Juan Manuel presta forma castellana en el Libro de los Estados á la leyenda budista de Barlaam y Josafat." He will show in his introduction to vol. iv of Lope's works that the form D. Juan Manuel chose is closely related to the *Lalita Vistara*.

<sup>40</sup> Riv. li, p. 448.

adding here is: El Principe del desierto y hermitaño de Palacio, by Villanueva Nuñez and José de Luna (Barr. p. 488). The MS. was formerly in the Osuna library; it is now in the Bibl. Nac. The title-page runs:

Comedia famosa | El Principe del desierto  
y her- | mitaño de Palacio | Personas que hab-  
lan en ella:

Barlan viexo.  
Demonio que ha de hazer  
Nacor y celio.  
Tolomeo, Rey de Egipto.  
Porcia su hermana.  
Zafran gracioso.  
Dos Angeles.  
Musica y acompañamient.

2. Libro de los Enx., 215.<sup>41</sup>

b. Another "Geschichte"<sup>42</sup> of the King who sees two poor people living in great contentment, and by the advice of his companion is converted, is found in

1. Libro de los Enx. 288.<sup>43</sup>

c. Still another,<sup>44</sup> of the young man who runs away to keep from marrying a wealthy lady, and later marries a pious old man's pious daughter:

1. Libro de los Enx. 286.<sup>45</sup>

Of the Parables enumerated as such by Kuhn we find:

1. "Todestrompete und Kästchen," in the form given by Braunscholtz, according to the *De camerone* x, i, in Torquemada, *Coloquios satiricos*<sup>46</sup> fos. 12-13.

2. Man and Bird.

1. El cavallero Cifar gives<sup>47</sup> a rather lengthened version; the hunter, not satisfied with the lesson, tries to catch the bird again and loses his life.

<sup>41</sup> P. 499.

<sup>42</sup> Liebrecht, pp. 113-116; he calls it a Parable; I do not give it that name, in order to avoid confusion.

<sup>43</sup> P. 516.

<sup>44</sup> Liebrecht, 117-119, calls it a Parable.

<sup>45</sup> P. 516.

<sup>46</sup> Barrera, p. 397; Salvá i, No. 1452.

<sup>47</sup> P. 180-81, Capit. iv of the *Segunda parte*.



3. The man in the well.

1. Libro de los Gatos, 484<sup>8</sup>

Instead of honey (as in B. and J., *Cal. y Dimn.*; *Leg. Aur.*, etc.) the tree to which the man clings bears apples.

4. The man with his three friends.

All the versions thus far mentioned, have nothing in common with the Story as told in B. and J.<sup>49</sup> They all<sup>50</sup> treat of a son who fancies he has many friends, while his father wonderingly states that he himself has only one,<sup>51</sup> and advises his son to try his friends by pretending that he has killed a man and seeing who will help him. The son is disappointed, but his father's friend is ready immediately to aid him. B. and J. has the Parable of a man who had two very dear friends, and one whom he did not cherish much; when however in sore trouble, he is scorned or merely pitied by the first two, while the third cheerfully saves him, whereupon the moral, that wealth and friends avail one not, but only virtues and good works. This essentially different parable is found in the *Libro de Exemplos*, No. 16, as edited by Morel Fatio.<sup>52</sup>

5. Love for Woman.

As mentioned above, I may add:

1. Villegas, *Fructus Sanctorum*, fo. 335, v<sup>o</sup>.

2. Another version, l. c., fo. 335, v<sup>o</sup>.

3. Feliciano de Silva, *Segunda Comedia de Celestina*, cena 31.<sup>53</sup>

4. Ribadeneyra, *Flos S.*, 1616, vol. ii, 485.<sup>54</sup>

48 Riv. li, p. 557.

49 Liebrecht, p. 95-97.

50 As also the one published for the first time in *Romania*, p. 493. The *Disc. Cler.*, in Migne, *Patrol. S. Lat.*, vol. 157, p. 673-4, contains the same story and the one following in *Romania* as if they belonged together, though we find them headed *Fabula Prima* and *Fabula ii*, for which latter see also Cifar, p. 25-31.

51 Sometimes only half of one, *Rom.* vii, p. 493; *Castigos é Docum.* p. 157, both after *Disc. Cler.*; or one and a half, as in *Lucanor*, 48.

52 *Rom.* vii, p. 491-92.

53 *Col. de Libr. Raros ó Cur.*, vol. ix, p. 373.

54 In the play by Villanueva Nufiez, Josafat declares that what has most impressed him is the human face, by its endless variety. The same trait is found, for example, in the beginning of *Lucanor* (Patronio, Riv. li, p. 368); *Libro d. l. Enx.* 332 (p. 527); *La losana Andaluza* (*Col. de Libros Esp. Raros ó Curiosos*, vol. i) p. 312; Antonio Sanchez Tortoles, *El Entretenido*, vol. i, 1729, p. 227; all after Pliny, *Hist. Nat.*, Lib. xii, cap. i.

Kuhn has (p. 82) an "Anhang ii. B. and J. als Heilige der Christlichen Kirche."

Of the special breviaries of Spanish churches, I have inspected the following, all in the Bibl. Nacional, none of which contains the slightest mention of our Saints:

1. Breviarium Gothicum, ed. Lorenzana, Madrid, 1775.<sup>55</sup>

2. Missale Muzarabicum, MS. D. D. 65.<sup>56</sup>

3. Acta et Passiones Martyrum, MS. D. D. 34, 35, 36.<sup>57</sup>

4. Breviarium Burgense, s. a. MS.

5. Brev. Caesaraugustanum. 1497.

6. Brev. Zamoran. s. a.

7. Brev. Segobiense. s. a.

8. Brev. Oscense et Iacense, Zarag., 1505.

9. Brev. Maioric. Venet., 1506.

10. Brev. bracharense. Salam., 1512.

11. Brev. Ces'august. 1527.

12. Brev. Gienense. Hispal., 1528.

13. Brev. Salmantic., s. l. 1541.

14. Brev. Dertus. 1547.

15. Brev. Ebor. Olysipp., 1548.

16. Brev. Pompelon. (*sic*) 1551.

17. Brev. Placent. Venet., 1553.

18. Brev. Conchens. Cuenca, 1558.

19. Brev. Segunt. Seguntiae, 1561.

20. Brev. Ilerdens. Lerida, 1571.

The writer would be thankful for any data that might lead to further additions to this paper.

F. DE HAAN.

Johns Hopkins University.

#### GERMAN GRAMMAR.

*Deutsche Grammatik.* Gotisch, Alt-, Mittel- und Neuhochdeutsch, von W. WILMANN'S. Erste Abteilung: Lautlehre. Strassburg: 1893. 8vo, pp. xix, 332.

THE book was noted under "Brief Mention" in Vol. viii, No. 6 of the NOTES. As the first part is now complete and the rest does not give signs of forthcoming, the time has perhaps come for a fuller review.

The title obviously suggests a comparison with Kauffmann's little book, *Deutsche Grammatik, Kurzgefasste Laut- und Formenlehre*

55 Sanchez Moguel, l. c. p. 55, note 42.

56 Sanch. Mog. note 43.

57 *Ibid.*, p. 57, note 47.

des Gotischen, Alt-, Mittel- u. Neuhochdeutschen, itself a revision of Vilmar's *Grammar*. There is little or no similarity between the two books, however. Kauffmann treats in outline merely, is schematic, emphasizes the older periods; Wilmanns, on the contrary, treats, not without some diffuseness, in detail, and gives most prominence to New High German. Hence a certain lack of proportion is observable in the book: the historic foundation has been slighted, important matters entirely omitted. Aside from the "Übersicht der Laute" there are no introductory statements of any kind. This is the more to be regretted since from its very plan, as indicated by the title, the book is rather heterogeneous in character, though one may fully agree with the author when he says ("Vorrede," p. vi), "Dass ich das Gotische zum Ausgangspunkt nahm, obwohl es nicht die Muttersprache des Deutschen ist, erschien mir durchaus unbedenklich und wird niemanden irren."

His aim and method the author outlines as follows ("Vorrede," pp. vi-vii):

Mein Ziel war, ein Lehrbuch der historischen Grammatik für die zu schreiben, die sich für das höhere Lehrfach vorbereiten. Daher habe ich mich beschränkt auf die Sprachen, deren Kenntnis von ihnen vorausgesetzt wird, auf das Gotische, Althochdeutsche, Mittelhochdeutsche und Neuhochdeutsche. . . . Von fremden Sprachen habe ich . . . fast nur das Griechische und Lateinische herangezogen und bloss construierte Sprachformen, so viel es anging, gemieden.

This last feature will, however, be regarded as an element of weakness, rather than of strength, by the large class of teachers and students who have, for a long time past, felt the need of a compendium of Comparative Grammar from the German side, a compendium that should be scientific in its matter, and still perspicuous and easily intelligible in its manner of presentation, a book such as we have for the Classical Languages in the grammars of Brugmann and Stolz. The articles in Paul's *Grundriss* do not meet the latter of these requirements, and Wilmanns' book also, from the very limitations indicated above, falls short of them. For text-books ostensibly on a comparative basis, this fearfulness of citing forms not perfectly familiar, of drawing illustrations from

languages other than classical, this inclination towards leaving half the story untold, underrating the serious purpose of the reader and shunning difficulties and problems in favor of carefully culled examples to illustrate theoretically general rules, have played an altogether too prominent part in the text-books of the past. It should at once be added, however, that aside from his treatment of the "Vorgeschichte" Wilmanns does not err in the last of these particulars. On the contrary, his statements of problems, of possible solutions, are, to my mind, the most valuable part of his work, from a scientific as well as from a pedagogical point of view. The author is decidedly at his best here: his command of the material is admirable, his analysis searching, his statement lucid. The advantage to the student of the perspective thus gained is not easily overestimated. It serves to bring him in touch with the work of his time, and by telling him what is known, gives him a basis from which to work, and at the same time indicates the direction that future investigations must or may follow.

To enter upon details of treatment, there is under the heading of "Übersicht der Laute" a survey of phonetic facts. This outline is very unsatisfactory, so much so, that the disclaimer entered by the author: "Die folgenden Bemerkungen sollen nicht in die Phonetik einführen," will scarcely serve as an excuse. The table of consonants (§ 8) is altogether inadequate. It seems to have been constructed solely for New High German, but even then there is no way provided for distinguishing, for example, between front and back *ch*. The great variety of terms employed to designate one and the same class of sounds are also confusing. For stops we have "Explosivae," "Verschluss- oder Schlaglaute;" for spirants, "Spirantes," "Reibelaute," "Fricativae." Such a sentence as: "Um die . . . Reibelaute zu bezeichnen, nimmt man früher gebräuchliche Zeichen zu Hülfe: für die stimmhaften Spiranten *b, d, g*, für den stimmlosen dentalen Reibelaut *p*" (p. 5) cannot but lead a beginner astray. That these shortcomings are not due to excessive condensation may be seen by comparing Wilmanns' "Übersicht" with the introductory statements concerning Phonetics

in Brugmann's *Grundriss*, which, while less detailed, are far more satisfactory. This deficiency is the more to be regretted since the author has, in various places, paid so much attention to phonetic problems. In itself this is a refreshing sign. The principles of phonetics have been altogether too little applied to the phenomena of Germanic Grammar. We have had little more than the statement and grouping of established facts, without attempt to arrive at a *rationale* of sound change; phonetic analysis and generalisation have been extremely rare. The truism that there can be no real science until the causal relations among facts are investigated, seems to have been almost ignored. Wilmanns' attitude in this particular is very original and deserves to be followed, even though one may not agree with his conclusions in every particular. For attempts to explain sound-change according to phonetic principles, cf. pp. 94, 98, 161, 167, 172.

A curious tendency to personify language, to regard it as having a conscious purpose, shows itself here and there, involuntarily recalling the warning sounded against this in the Introduction to the *Morphologische Untersuchungen* of Osthoff and Brugmann. Though an unscientific conception of language at best, it may perhaps be merely regarded as an element of style where it concerns such metaphorical expressions as "Die nhd. Schriftsprache verhält sich ablehnend" (p. 228), or "... während *h* den Platz behauptete, der ihm ursprünglich zukam, und seine spätere Eroberung allmählich an *ch* aufgeben musste, behauptete sich *f* umgekehrt auf dem jünger erworbenen Platz und verlor die alte Besetzung mehr und mehr an das neu aufgenommene *v*" (p. 79). Here and there, however, this conception seems to have influenced the author's judgment. So on p. 197 where, after discussing the character of the new diphthongization as distinguished from the old, he concludes:

"Der Grund dass die Sprache schliesslich die umgekehrte Bahn verfolgte, kann darin liegen, dass sie die Diphthonge *ie*, *uo*, *üe* bereits besass."

Again, on pp. 202-3:

"Die Lücke, welche sich durch die Beseitigung der langen *i*, *u*, *ü* im Vocaleystem ergeben

hatte, wurde bald dadurch wieder ausgefüllt, dass die Diphthonge *ie*, *uo*, *üe* zu *i*, *u*, *ü* zusammengezogen wurden. Die beiden Vorgänge fügen sich so gut zu einander, dass man ursächlichen Zusammenhang vermuten möchte, doch hat ein solcher nicht stattgefunden."

So p. 217 *à propos* of the change in quantity and accent in New High German as compared with Middle High German:

"Natürlich könnte auch in einem Teil der Fälle die Änderung des Accentus, in einem anderen die Änderung in der Quantität das nächste Ziel der Sprache gewesen sein."

For other instances, cf. pp. 26, 27, 82.

An error of judgment was also made, it seems to me, in adhering in this larger work to the division of strong verbs adopted in the author's *Deutsche Schulgrammatik*. Classes iii, iv and v (according to Braune's grouping) are there united under the head of Class I, without further subdivision. In the present work the author has subdivided these as I<sup>a</sup> (=V), I<sup>b</sup> (=IV) and I<sup>c</sup> (=III) not, however, without now and then lapsing into error through still using his old terminology, saying I where he means I<sup>a</sup> and I<sup>b</sup>, etc. (cf. pp. 151, 158). This nomenclature, in origin the Müllenhoff classification, is naturally enough not explained anywhere in the *present* volume, and will prove very perplexing to one acquainted only with Sievers' *Ablaut*-rows. The author's choice may have been determined by his aim to write a grammar for those "die sich für das höhere Lehrfach vorbereiten," but it seems a pity that the uniformity in nomenclature which gives fair promise of becoming established, should be retarded by such variations from the usage of standard grammars.

In his spelling of Gothic words the author has followed Braune. Many forms with *v* instead of *w* have crept in, however. *Sovigan* p. 9, *svaihra*, *svaihrō* p. 13, *vulfs* p. 14, *vairhta*, *vairkjan* p. 23, *vaist* p. 24, *valvisōn*, *hlai-vasna*, *vileis*, *vileizu*, *tuzvērjan* p. 86, *vai* p. 106, and numerous other instances. Inconsistent also is the writing of *mims* on p. 94 with *s*, as compared with *aiz* on p. 86 with *z*.

A few other criticisms as to details.—P. 13. *gewesen* is not a very happily chosen example of preservation of *s* as compared with *waren*. —P. 16. The statement in §27 would seem to



be refuted by the identification made on p. 14 of German *ge-* and Latin *co-*.—P. 99. Sievers does not attempt to explain the Gothic forms *lastus* and *usskawjan*. The former he does not even mention; concerning the latter he merely remarks, "Aus unbekanntem Grunde ist die alte Silbentrennung in *usskawjan* geblieben."—P. 144. "vocallose *ŋ, ɣ*" seems a rather unfortunate expression.—P. 205. The statement that Veldeke never rimes *ie* with *i* is incorrect. Cf. p. 204.

The book is printed with a fair degree of correctness. Of misprints perhaps the following need correction: p. 28. Read "*z* und *k*" instead of "*z* und *h*."—P. 47. Read "In- und Anlaut" instead of "In- und Auslaut."—P. 151. Read *γόvv* instead of *γovú*.—P. 159. Read *Segimérus*.—P. 164. Read "*e*<idg. *e*" instead of "*e*>idg. *e*." On p. 171 this same sign is used in a rather questionable manner in "Idg. *ž, g, d*>hd. *đ*."—P. 176. Read "Vor *w*" instead of "Vor *a*."—P. 205. Read "in den md. Hss." instead of "in den nd. Hss."—P. 229. Read "*a* und *e*" instead of "*o* und *e*."—P. 234. Read "die unbetonten Vor- und Endsilben" instead of "die betonten Vor- und Endsilben."

It will be seen that the exceptions taken to the work refer to a large extent either to sins of omission or to matters of detail. As to the first, much that seemed needed in Part I has, no doubt, been purposely reserved for the hypothetical fifth volume. On the other hand Streitberg's *Deutsche Grammatik* as announced by Messrs. Breitkopf and Härtel (cf. *Indog. Forsch.*, iii. Bd. Anz. No. 3, p. 188) will probably supply the historical foundation that seems to be somewhat lacking in Wilmanns. As to criticism of details, I am conscious that a review written from an American point of view cannot but do some injustice to a book that was written for a German public and that a particular kind of German public. Withal it remains a serviceable class-book and suggestive book of reference.

B. J. Vos.

Johns Hopkins University.

#### FRENCH READINGS.

*A Scientific French Reader*, by ALEXANDER W. HERDLER, Instructor in Modern Lang-

uages, Princeton University. 8vo, pp. 186. Boston: Ginn & Co. 1894.

*An Introduction to French Authors*, being a Reader for Beginners, by ALPHONSE N. VAN DAELL, Professor in the Mass. Institute of Technology. 8vo, pp. 251. Boston: Ginn & Co. 1894.

SOME familiarity with the more common scientific terms is now-a-days a necessity for every reader of modern literature. A *Scientific French Reader* is, therefore, to be considered not merely as an introduction for the scientific student into the literature of his special science; its plan and contents should be such as to familiarize the ordinary student of French with the language and terminology of French works on science. Mr. Herdler's little volume seems to meet these two requirements. A part of the second year in French, say from eight to ten weeks, could hardly be spent more profitably than in the study of these one hundred and forty pages, not counting the space of about seventeen pages filled with illustrations. The forty-eight selections contained in the book treat of the most interesting applications of physics, chemistry, mechanics, and electricity, and include essays on the modern methods of locomotion, on recent architecture and technological processes. It would be difficult to suggest a more attractive method of teaching the student so much of scientific French as every reader of the language ought to know, than this *Reader* provides. The notes (10 pp.) and especially the vocabulary (20 pp.), which are both indispensable, have evidently been prepared with the greatest care and will be found quite sufficient.

The first part (113 pp.) of Professor Van Daell's *Reader for Beginners* leaves nothing to be desired; the selections are sufficiently easy, well adapted for young pupils, short and yet complete in themselves, and, with only one or two exceptions, all from writers of the nineteenth century. Poetry is but sparingly represented, about one-third of the whole number of selections, occupying hardly more than one-tenth of the space, being in verse. Foot-notes judiciously used in Part I, and a vocabulary (for the whole book) make this part convenient and attractive for beginners.

As to the utility of Part II, the opinions of teachers will be divided. Ten pages of descriptive geography and forty pages devoted to a "Résumé d'histoire de France" will by some be found handy for reference, and as a source of useful information not so easily attainable in any other way. But would not a map of France, such as Delagrave & Co. and other houses publish and sell for a few cents, placed in the hands of every pupil, accomplish better the end which the author seeks to attain by his chapter on geography (the maps in the book are decidedly too small and indistinct)? And would not the author's purpose "to awaken their [the pupils'] dormant curiosity for history, for all the higher forms of French literature" have been better served by the introduction of a few more chapters from the most brilliant French historians, similar to that from Michelet, the only one in the book, than by means of hundreds of brief statements of historical facts in chronological order? It is true, if the teacher use this part of the *Reader* in accordance with the author's suggestions, and if he be a good teacher of history as well as of languages, and skillful in combining the two, the results will be satisfactory enough. At all events, the author is right in his demand for a better knowledge of, and greater interest in, French history on the part of students of French, and it is much to be hoped that his book will further their attainment. Some notes on the authors represented in the *Reader*, not so much biographical as introductory to their works, aiding the interested student in choosing some of the best volumes for private reading, might not have been out of place in an *Introduction to French Authors*.

*Ypsilanti. Mich.*

A. LODEMAN.

#### FRENCH LITERATURE.

*Le Monde où l'on s'ennuie*, Comédie en trois actes par ÉDOUARD PAILLERON, with introduction and English notes by A. C. PENDLETON, M. A., Professor of modern languages, Bethany College, W. Va. D. C. Heath & Co., Boston: 134 pp., 1894.

THE editor of this edition has done her work in a manner worthy of the highest praise. She

has brought to the attention of students of French the most charming of recent French comedies, and has shown delicate feeling in rendering into English those parts of the text in which a student might be expected to find difficulties.

Thirteen years\* after its first appearance, this comedy still continues to delight and amuse the patrons of the Comédie Française. Few French plays produced since 1850 have enjoyed such a success.

Whether it was the intention of M. Pailleron to satirize Caro, or some one else, matters little. The essential fact is that the *précieux* are still with us, and that the author aimed another blow at their affectation. Till a comparatively recent time, it has been claimed by literary historians that Molière gave them their death-blow. This was by no means the case. Amid wars and revolutions and the brute force of Paris mobs, their voices have been hushed, but they have lived on, and now invade the halls of the Sorbonne and the Collège de France itself. It was against them that Boileau directed his *Satires*, and Roederer<sup>1</sup> has shown that they still rose bolder and more brilliant than before. Quinault was their darling. In 1677 they caballed against *Phèdre* in favor of Pradon. Voltaire attacked the traces of affectation which he discovered in the comedies of Marivaux, in the sermons of Massillon and even in Montesquieu. Was there not something of it also in the young men who gathered around Victor Hugo in 1830? And are not the symbolists the heirs of a long lineage? The lecture room of Caro was the modern Hôtel de Rambouillet, and the aim of Pailleron was similar to the aim of Molière.

THOMAS LOGIE

*Rutgers College.*

#### FRENCH LITERATURE.

*Cinq-Mars ou une conjuration sous Louis XIII* par le C<sup>te</sup> ALFRED DE VIGNY de l'Académie française, abridged and edited, with introduction and notes, by CHARLES SANKEY, M. A., Boston: D. C. Heath & Co., 1893. xxvii+265 pp., 80.

<sup>1</sup> "Mémoire pour servir à l'histoire de la Société polie en France." Paris, 1835.

THE story of the times of Richelieu is exciting enough when told by some dry historian, but there are no limits to its interest when molded by the art of such a novelist as de Vigny. The historical novel is as fascinating reading as exists, and mainly because its characters did really live and move in this world, and though the historical events may not have occurred exactly as told by the novelist, yet, through the latter's skill, they become more vivid and appeal with greater power to our memory, as well as to our imagination. The mistakes, or changes, may be corrected by consulting some accurate history and thus, by means of these two influences—the novelist's and the historian's—we become thoroughly acquainted with some particular period of the world's history. This is what de Vigny did for all French readers when he wrote *Cinq-Mars*, and, in a relative way, this is what has been done for students by Mr. Sankey in his edition of this well-known work. The interest of the reader is sustained from the opening page to the very end, there is hardly a single uninteresting line, and at the close we only wish the novel were continued, and continued indefinitely, so as to include all historical happenings. It is true that de Vigny is sometimes painfully inaccurate, but his blunders, for the most part probably intentional, are so prominent, that they can be distinctly remembered and corrected later by reading the historical introduction of Mr. Sankey, for the editor has taken pains to correct all historical inaccuracies and to impress them as errors on the mind of the student.

The notes are as full and as conscientiously prepared as notes well could be; every personage is discussed, every allusion, every interesting point is explained, and the whole is positively an intellectual treat to the reader. The editor is careful not to run into extremes, not to be too partial nor yet too condemning, and it is a real pleasure to read what he has to say. If the character of a lexicographer can be inferred from his definitions of words, so may the character of an editor be understood from his notes, and here is one of Mr. Sankey's (the italics being mine): commenting on the word *parvenu*, as applied by de Vigny to

Richelieu, he says "this epithet, true enough of Mazarin and others, is unjust when used of Richelieu; *not that it is ever a reproach in the eyes of a sensible man.*" If we may infer from this note anything concerning the character and conscientiousness of the editor, we are not surprised at the pleasure afforded by the perusal of this text.

This is great praise, and it is exactly here that the danger lies; it might be said, and with almost too great an approach to the truth, that this text is suited for teachers especially, and not even for all teachers, but only for the more ambitious. I should be afraid lest students, even at the end of their second year, would not profit, as I might wish, by the excellent editing of this story, even though by rapid reading, they find the narrative, in itself, most absorbing. This is however a "danger," not a fault, and it simply behooves the teacher himself to be careful not to use this text too early in the course.

EDWIN S. LEWIS

Princeton University.

#### FRENCH LANGUAGE.

1. *Minimum French Grammar and Reader* with Exercises and Graded Selections for Reading and Dictation, and Review Exercises for Translation into French. By EDWARD S. JOYNES. 8vo, viii, 269 pp. New York: Henry Holt and Co.; F. W. Christern. Boston: Carl Schoenhof. 1893. Price, 80 cents.
2. *Livre de lecture et de conversation.* Par C. FONTAINE. 8vo, vi, 249 pp. Boston: D. C. Heath & Co., 1893. Price, 95 cents.
3. *An Introduction to the French Language.* Being a Practical Grammar with Exercises. By ALPHONSE N. VAN DAELL. 8vo, xvii, 229 pp. Boston: Ginn & Co., 1893. Price, \$1.
4. *The Living Method for Learning how to Think in French.* By CHARLES F. KROEH. 140, vii pp. London and Hoboken, N. J. Published by the Author. Price, \$1.
5. a. *Enseignement par les yeux* (Leçons de choses) basé sur les cartes murales d'ÉDOUARD HOELZEL. Par A. BECHTEL.



Édition destinée à l'enseignement primaire supérieur. 8vo, x, 147 pp. Vienne: Édouard Hoelzel, 1893.

b. Handausgabe von HÖLZEL'S *Wandbildern* als Beigabe zu BECHTEL'S *Enseignement par les yeux* (Leçons de choses) und zu WINTER'S "*Hölzel's Wandbilder in ihrer praktischen Verwendung beim deutschen Sprachunterrichte*." Acht Bilder in Farbendruck, Bildgrösse 19/29 Cm. Wien: Ed. Hölzel. Price, Fl. o.80 (35 cts).

6. a. *A Short French Grammar*. By C. H. GRANDGENT. 8vo, x, 150 pp. Price, 60 cents.

b. *French Lessons and Exercises* to be used with Grandgent's Short French Grammar. 1. *First Year's Course for Schools*. Number 1. 12mo, 1, 34 pp. 2. *First Year's Course for Colleges*. Number 1. 12mo, 1, 42 pp. Boston: D. C. Heath & Co., 1894.

PROFESSOR JOYNES' endeavor (No. 1) to shorten the grammatical material and gain, in this way, more time and space for reading in the elementary instruction of French, is a highly praiseworthy one. The arrangement of his book does not differ much (excepting in details and, perhaps, in the graded selections for reading) from the traditional method which still seems to be the favorite mode of teaching in the United States: Some remarks upon orthography (Chapter i) and pronunciation (Chapters ii-iv); then small portions of grammar, a few forms, rules or explanations (Chapter v: a. The Articles, b. Present Tenses of *avoir* and *être*; Chapter vi: a. Nouns, b. Present and Imperative of regular verbs, etc.), followed by lists of words, a considerable number of disconnected French sentences and a French story or anecdote, entire or fragmentary; and, finally, several pages (pp. 204-229) containing review exercises, that is, disconnected English sentences and English paraphrases of the above mentioned French stories and anecdotes for translating into French.

The first chapter, which treats of orthography, includes remarks upon pronunciation, especially upon stress and quantity. Some of these are very curious. "Pronunciation," says the author (p. 5), "must be learned from the teacher" (very good). Cf. also Preface, p. v.

"The Pronunciation is placed, where it belongs, at the beginning, but with due help may be better studied along with the earliest grammar lessons than in a body beforehand. The directions given are intended to be simply helpful and approximate: only voice can teach voice (*very well said!*). No attempt, however, is made at phonetic transliteration, because none is believed to be helpful (?) in elementary work."

The writer himself apparently does not think much of his "indications" concerning pronunciation (Chapters i-iv). I believe they are mostly quite useless and frequently not "helpful," but hurtful for teachers and pupils. The author might have shortened and, certainly, also improved his book a great deal by leaving out these "indications" altogether. I may be allowed to quote a few passages chosen at random:

"Circumflex vowels are long." (p. 2). "A consonant between two vowels is joined with the latter; as *pro-ba-bi-li-té*. . . It will be observed that this gives to the vowels a more open and distinct sound than in English." (P. 2). "The terms long and short are, however, frequently used to mark the quality of the vowel, rather than quantity proper. In general the value of any syllable in French depends rather on the tonic accent than on quantity—as also in English." (P. 3). "In poetry this *e* (*e muet*) is usually sounded. . . A silent final consonant leaves the syllable open, as though the word ended with the preceding vowel; as, *cas*, pronounced *ca*. In such case the vowel is usually long." (P. 4). "The usual pronunciation of the simple vowels is as follows: *a* long, like *a* in *father*; *car*, *cas*, *mât*, *pâte*. *a* short, like *a* in *alas*; *ma*, *mal*, *malade*, *pâtte*. *e* closed, like *e* in *met*; *avec*, *tel*, *telle*, *blesse*. *e* open, like *e* in *over*; *le*, *me*, *ne*, *leva*, *releva*. . . ." (P. 5).

It cannot be expected that a phonetist should comment upon or seriously criticise statements that contain so strange and peculiar opinions.

Nos. 2, 3, and 4 are exceedingly clever books. The most radical and at the same time most consistent of the three authors is Mr. Kroeh. If judged by a cool and critical observer, he would appear too zealous and demonstrative in praising the excellence of his own work or works. But I like his enthusiasm, and I should be glad to know that he has won a great many friends and followers

who teach modern languages in the class-room according to his, or similar views, with the same enthusiasm and success. I also hope his efforts and example will help destroy the routine of "recitation lessons" (alas! still prevalent in modern-language instruction throughout the majority of American schools), the dreary imitation of Latin and Greek lessons, and make the formula, "to hear the lesson," a British archaism in this country, at least for the department of modern languages. Mr. Kroeh considers his system as an outgrowth of the Natural Method, "invented" in 1865 by Prof. Gottlieb Heness and widely diffused since by the zeal of Dr. L. Sauveur and others (cf. p. 141). The exercises contained in his *Living Method for Learning how to think in French* have been designed by the author for self-instruction and as a supplement to instruction received in the class-room, no matter what method is employed by the professor (cf. p. 141).

The confident "inventor" of the *Living Method* seems to think pronunciation a comparatively easy and secondary matter which may be learned by self-instruction. He says (p. 3):

"If (!) you need any assistance as regards the pronunciation, send for a copy of Kroeh's Pronunciation of French, published by the author, Stevens Institute of Technology, Hoboken, N. J. Price, 35 c. In this little book all the difficulties of pronunciation are carefully explained and illustrated in progressive exercises."

The author is evidently a good business-man, but I do not understand how all the different classes of students using his work on the *Living Method*, either with or without explanations concerning pronunciation, either without any teacher or with a teacher, either with a teacher following the same method or with a teacher employing another method, can succeed in thinking in French, speaking French continually, and "keeping out the English" in their instruction. I fancy most of them, and certainly such as study the *Living Method* without a teacher, will acquire, in this way, "some sort of language" which, so far as it is meant to be a spoken language, will necessarily bear but a very faint resemblance to real French. However, it seems to me

likely that they will soon give up their original design, return to their old linguistic habits in spite of the author's good advice and precepts, and do as they did before, that is, think in English and speak English. I could not, and would not, blame them for their turning from the new study, for I do not see any use in learning "some sort of language" instead of French.

Do not promise too much, and do not try to satisfy everybody—this is an excellent business principle for writers of school-books and inventors of methods.

Mr. Fontaine, being a native of France, probably thinks that pronunciation is a matter of secondary importance and can be easily acquired by students, because he himself has never felt any difficulty in pronouncing French correctly and fluently. There are, accordingly, no indications whatever concerning French sounds in his whole book (No. 2), and I really believe, to say nothing at all about so difficult a subject is better than to give directions and explanations of doubtful value and of a kind similar to those given in some of the works noted here. The author only remarks in his preface:

"Si . . l'étude d'une langue a pour but de donner aux élèves une connaissance pratique de cette langue, il faut que, dès les premières leçons, l'élève commence à se familiariser avec ses sons: voilà pourquoi on a écrit ce livre entièrement en français."

The writer evidently means that the pupil has to learn a correct pronunciation by practice from a teacher who pronounces well himself, and he does not seem to doubt the truth of Professor Joynes' observation that pronunciation must be learned from the teacher, and that only voice can teach voice (see above). The book is written entirely in French, and combines skilfully the conversational and object-lesson method with grammatical exercises, treated more or less from a French point of view. I am sure it will prove very useful, especially in the elementary instruction of conscientious teachers of French nationality, and in every school where French is taught as a living language, and not, like Latin and Greek, only for the sake of a reading-knowledge and some grammatical notions.

I do not like the exercises in which Mr. Fontaine, following the example of French grammars published for the use of schools in France, has purposely made grammatical mistakes which the pupils are supposed to correct. Such exercises seem to me rather useless and really dangerous for foreign students.—A few misprints have crept into the work; as, for instance, *il vainct* (*vainc*—p. 238).

Dr. van Daell's *Introduction to the French Language* (No. 3) is the work of an able, intelligent and progressive teacher who knows his subject well, and likes to increase his knowledge and improve his methods. It is apparently the result of many years' experience and long, careful preparation. It has many features, many good features, in common with Fontaine's *Livre de lecture et de conversation*, and also combines the conversational and object-lesson method with grammatical exercises. But these have been arranged by the author in a greater measure from the stand-point of English speakers, and exhibit the influence of the traditional translation-method (*thèmes* and *versions*), probably in order to suit the taste of the great mass of instructors. The book is provided with a French-English and an English-French vocabulary, and most of the explanations are given in English. I presume French teachers of American or English nationality will accept it, for these reasons, with more readiness than the work of Mr. Fontaine.

I am glad that Mr. van Daell has given up his antipathy for phonetics, and that he is beginning to appreciate its usefulness in teaching modern languages. Some of his "Practical Remarks on French Pronunciation" (pp. xv-xxvii) show clearly that he has studied with much profit a few works upon phonetics; he is, as I like to repeat, a progressive teacher, open to conviction and accessible to new ideas. Cf. Preface, p. iv:

"I have not attempted the impossible task of rendering French pronunciation by English equivalents."

I think the author has acted very wisely in not attempting this impossible and entirely useless task.

.... "If one will make a study of the science of Phonetics, he can arrive at excellent results (!) and understand an accurate representation of sounds: it would be an absurdity (! ?) to attempt anything of the kind in a book destined for the mass of pupils. But I hope that the time is not far distant when most teachers of language will give this point the attention which it so fully deserves (!), and which has so generally been refused (!)."

Very well. Good and sensible teachers are more useful and necessary than the most excellent text-books!

Hölzel's *Wandbilder* (Spring, Summer, Autumn, Winter, Farm, Mountains, Forest, and City), the large-sized pictures as well as the copies on a reduced scale, indicated above (No. 5, b), are to serve the aims and needs of the object-lesson method. They are favorably known in Austria and Germany, and much used in the schools of these countries in the elementary instruction of German, English, and French.

Mr. Bechtel's *Enseignement par les yeux* (No. 5, a), a long commentary upon the pictures just noted, composed of numberless questions and answers, is rather dry and monotonous reading, and can be made interesting only by a frequent and casual improvisation in the class-room and the enlivening voice of the teacher. It may be of some use, I think, for those who have not yet had much experience in teaching, and wish to get acquainted with the ways and means of the *Anschaunngsunterricht* applied to a foreign language. But a teacher who does not speak French quite fluently, and is obliged to rely entirely upon such a commentary, ought not to venture upon the object-lesson method: his attempt would undoubtedly be a tremendous failure.

Mr. Grandgent's new book (No. 6, a) is a concise, clear, accurate and systematic exposition of everything that is essential and absolutely necessary for a foreigner in the abstract study of French grammar. It is, moreover, a somewhat modest, but very intelligent endeavor to base French grammar on phonetics; and as it is the first attempt of the kind in this country, I esteem it a work of the highest importance. I hope it will be introduced into



many schools and thus prepare the minds of teachers and students for further and greater reforms. It fully deserves the praise that has been so liberally bestowed upon it and so heartily expressed in a great number of recommendations printed in the publishers' catalogue.\*

I shall not undertake, here, to criticise certain details of Grandgent's *Short French Grammar*; I think it unnecessary since I have already informed the author himself of what I consider as objectionable or insufficient in it, and capable of improvement for later editions. Besides, the book is being practically tested this year in a beginners' class at the Johns Hopkins University.

The exercises relating to the different parts of Grandgent's grammar, and destined for different courses of schools and colleges, have been and will be published separately (No. 6, b).

A. RAMBEAU.

Johns Hopkins University.

#### CORRESPONDENCE.

##### NODIER AND PETER IBBETSON

TO THE EDITORS OF MOD. LANG. NOTES.

SIRS:—In recent numbers of the *Critic* (Nov. 17, 24, Dec. 1) interest in Du Maurier's story *Trilby* expressed itself in an inquiry concerning Nodier's charming *conte* of the same name. The fact was brought out that Musset makes use of this name in his *Réponse à M. Charles Nodier* and that Balzac employs it as the name of a type in the "Histoire des Treize" (*Scènes de la Vie Parisienne*, 1843, vol. 1, p. 48). The scene of Nodier's story is laid in Scotland, his *Trilby* is a sort of household fairy or familiar, and is moreover apparently of the masculine gender. Unless we may suppose the origin of the *Trilby* family to be like that of the Tweedys, we may conclude that only in name and nationality is it possible that he was our *Trilby*'s ancestor.

This evidence, however, of Du Maurier's knowledge of Nodier encourages one to consider the question whether the seed-thought of Du Maurier's earlier work, *Peter Ibbetson*,

\*Cf. MOD. LANG. NOTES, vol. ix, pp. 436-67.

may not have been found in Nodier's pages, albeit in a work of very different character from the *contes*. In the *Mélanges tirés d'une Petite Bibliothèque*, Paris, 1829, pp. 209-212, Nodier speaks of a little volume ("à la vérité fort rare") *L'Art de se rendre Heureux par les Songes*, c'est-à-dire en se procurant telle espèce de songe que l'on puisse désirer conformément à ses inclinations. Francfort et Leipsic, 1746, in-8; v. fauve.

Nodier does not understand why this work has been attributed to Franklin. Furthermore, he says:

"On n'oseroit prononcer non plus bien positivement sur la question de savoir s'il faut le regarder comme une spéculation adroite sur la crédulité des malheureux qui éprouvent le besoin, si commun sur la terre, d'embellir leur sommeil par des illusions que la vie refuse, ou comme un simple jeu d'imagination."

He goes on in his gravely humorous way to say that the directions given are like those of the alchemist or magician—e. g., to find the plant before which chains drop and bolts fly, one must first find "un nid de pie noire" and "malheureusement il n'y a point de pie noire." But he would not, he says, pretend to deny the possibility of such a science as that which the book teaches or to affirm its inaccessibility to man's investigating spirit. No one, he thinks, can have failed to note the fact that particular sorts of dreams recur consequent upon particular hygienic conditions—he has been assured, he tells us, by persons of sober and serious character that their choice of food exerts a marked influence upon the nature of their dreams, in such a way as to render them more or less agreeable. Then more seriously "les enfants croient que l'usage de la cannelle donne des songes heureux, et j'ai retrouvé dans les prisons cette espèce de superstition que j'avois laissée dans le collège." Nodier regrets that these matters have never been examined in a philosophic spirit:

"il est déplorable que de pareilles questions restent en proie aux folies des onéiromanciens et des charlatans. . . . Il seroit peut-être important d'examiner quel rôle ces illusions de la nuit ont joué dans nos croyances, dans nos erreurs, dans nos passions, dans nos crimes; et je suis persuadé qu'une bonne physiologie du sommeil auroit par exemple épargné de sanglantes méprises à la justice."

Certainly there seem to be here two or three unmistakable suggestions of Peter Ibbetson's curious faculty and experience. For another element, that of the continuity of his dream-experience, we may turn to Bulwer's *Pilgrims of the Rhine*, Chapter xxiii, entitled, "The Life of Dreams." There the "enthusiast" tells how he

"began to ponder whether it might not be possible to connect dreams together . . . to make one night continue the history of the other, so as to bring together the same shapes and the same scenes and thus lead a connected and harmonious life not only in the one half of existence, but in the other, the richer and more glorious half." "Oh [says one of Bulwer's characters, after hearing his story] could the German have bequeathed to us his secret, what a refuge should we possess from the ills of earth! The dungeon and disease, poverty, affliction, shame, would cease to be the tyrants of our lot, and to Sleep we should confine our history and transfer our emotions."<sup>1</sup>

Du Maurier's personal contribution and enrichment of the basic notion consists in his blending of the dream-lives and dream-loves of Peter and the glorious Duchess of Towers. One need not suppose any hint or suggestion for this, but it seems quite possible that Du Maurier may have been reading some of the cases of "coincident dreaming" reported in the current works<sup>2</sup> treating of those strange goings-on in that queer borderland of hypnotism, somnambulism, suggestion, telepathy, and what-not, in which we all are—or have been—so interested.

It is somewhat curious that no work on dreams, even James Sully's pleasant article "Dreams as related to Literature" (*Forum*, vii, 67) mentions Nodier's *trouvaille* or Bulwer's romance. Considering the important part dreams have always played in literature, it would seem as if this use of them in a new direction by Bulwer and Du Maurier should be recorded. Indubitably we have in Du Maurier's story the ultimate fine flower of dream-romances, and an admirable example of a *genre* rare in our literature—the fantasy.

And Nodier's little article was, no doubt,

<sup>1</sup> Did Bulwer owe this idea to his studies in occultism?

<sup>2</sup> E. g. Podmore, F. *Apparitions and Thought-Transference*, Chap. x.

the cup which held the acorn from which the oaktree grew.<sup>3</sup>

CLARENCE GRIFFIN CHILD.

*Johns Hopkins University.*

#### EXPLANATION WANTED.

TO THE EDITORS OF MOD. LANG. NOTES:

SIRS:—I should be glad if any Keltic scholar would explain the Gaelic words in the following stanza from 'The Howlat':—

"Sa come the Ruke with a reid and a rane roch,  
A bard owt of Irland with Banachadee;  
Said, 'Gluntow guk dynyd dach hala mischy doch;  
Raikie hir a rug of the rost, or scho sall ryiue the  
Mich macmory ach mach mometir moch loch:  
Set hir doune, gif hir drink; quhat dele alis the?  
O Deremyne, O Donnall, O Dochardy droch'—  
(Thir ar his Irland Kingis of the Irischerye—)  
'O Knewlyn, O Conochor, O Gregre Makgrane;  
The schenachy, the clarschach,  
The ben schene, the ballach,  
The crekery, the corach,  
Scho kennis thaim ilkane.'"

WM. HAND BROWNE.

*Johns Hopkins University.*

#### LUTHER OM MESSENS CANON.

TO THE EDITORS OF MOD. LANG. NOTES.

SIRS:—In one of his annual reports,<sup>1</sup> Chr. Bruun gives an account of a rare book from the Danish reformation, a translation by an unknown hand, of Luther's "Vom dem Grewel der Sillmesse: so man den Canon nennet." The full Danish title is: "Om den grum=/me forferdelige Tiende Messe/ som Papisterne bruge i deris /latine Messe oc kallis/ Canon. /Morthen Luther/ I Magdeborg /MDxxv./ It is accurately described by Bruun as "in very small quarto, consisting of 16 sheets, unpaginated. . . signed Aij to D . . . 31 lines to the page. . . There are two copies in the Royal Library; the one complete belonged to Suhm, the other to Hielmstjerne. Resen had another copy." The missing portions in B. are the title page and in the preface, pp. 5 and 6.

<sup>3</sup> Since writing the above. Dr. W. Hand Browne has told me of a dream-romance, involving the notion of continuity of the dream-experience, which appeared in the *New York Times* about the year 1875.

<sup>1</sup> *Aarsberetninger fra det Store Kongelige Bibliotek*, 1869-74.

Several years ago, while in the Royal Library, my attention was called to these two books and an examination of the first page of each showed a number of slight variations not noted by Bruun in his otherwise detailed account. This discovery led me to compare the two carefully, with the result that the variations were found to be confined to the preface, the body of the work being the same in both copies. While such differences in early books are familiar enough from our own literature, even as late as Shakspeare, and by no means presuppose different editions, this case seems to be of special interest from the fact that the divergences are confined to a portion of the work. The reason for this I am wholly unable to state or even roughly to surmise, nor am I aware of any other instance of the kind.

All the divergences clearly fall under the head of printer's changes, substitutions of letters and differences in spacing and punctuation. Giving the forms in A, the complete copy, first and then those in B, and supplying pagination and line, the variations may be stated as follows:

Page 1; oc- och<sup>3</sup>, och- oc<sup>5</sup>, ath- at<sup>5</sup>, line ends with ath- with hw<sup>5</sup>, ath her- at her=<sup>8</sup> dem/- dem<sup>11</sup>, fatti= -fatti<sup>16</sup> wchris- wchrist<sup>19</sup>, ordinantz- ordinandz<sup>21</sup>, Almuen- almwen<sup>23</sup>, skul, skulle<sup>24</sup>, skickel- skickelse<sup>25</sup>, . -space<sup>28</sup>, Oc- och<sup>30</sup>.

Page 2.—Christelige- christelig<sup>1</sup>, vile- ville<sup>12</sup>, Da- Daa<sup>14</sup>, och- ock<sup>16</sup>, Oc- och<sup>17</sup>, swar- suar<sup>18</sup>, bespottel- bespottelse<sup>18</sup>, oc- och<sup>19</sup>, varre- vaare<sup>24</sup>, bespottel- bespottelse<sup>24</sup>, ladet- ladet<sup>27</sup>.

Page 3.—oc- och<sup>2</sup>, lenger- lenge<sup>4</sup>, vanwittighed- vanuittigheds, wforstandi= -wforstandigheds, fingre- line ends with dem<sup>6</sup>, och- oc<sup>7</sup>, omgengel= omgengelse<sup>14</sup>, det- line ends with dem<sup>16</sup>, till- til<sup>19</sup>, de- line ends with 11<sup>19</sup>, cap.- ca.<sup>20</sup>, døden- line ends with samtøcke<sup>20</sup>, ath ware- athware<sup>23</sup>, oc- och<sup>24</sup>, till- til<sup>26</sup>, till- til<sup>27</sup>, ath- at<sup>29</sup>.

Page 4.—huad- hwad<sup>1</sup>, oc- och<sup>6</sup>, pa- begins the following line<sup>6</sup>, lade- begins the following line<sup>7</sup>, och- oc<sup>17</sup>, til- till<sup>18</sup>, ehwor- ehuor<sup>20</sup>, de synis- desynis<sup>21</sup>, Och- Oc<sup>21</sup>, meddeler- medlere<sup>23</sup>, til- till<sup>25</sup>, doden- døden<sup>27</sup>, swmmen- sum-

men<sup>28</sup>, oc- och<sup>30</sup>, komme- komme<sup>30</sup>, oc- och<sup>31</sup>, skyld/- skyld<sup>31</sup>.

Page 7, the last of the preface, is the same in both copies.

DANIEL KILHAM DODGE.

University of Illinois.

#### THE OLD ENGLISH OPTATIVE OF UNEXPECTANT WISHING.

TO THE EDITORS OF MOD. LANG. NOTES.

SIRS:—It is generally assumed that sentences of the form, "O that Ishmael might live before thee!" (Gen. 17, 18), corresponding to Latin sentences beginning with *utinam*, do not exist in Old English, or at least that there is no clear evidence of their existence. Thus Mätzner says (*Eng. Gram.* 3, 430): "Der älteren Sprache sind Sätze dieser Art, worin *that* dem Lat. *utinam* entspricht und die einen Hauptsatz mit dem Begriffe des Wunsches voraussetzen, fremd." He cites only: "And þæt nān man nenne man ne underfō ne længe [var. 1. nā leng] þonne þreo niht (*Legg. Cnut.* I, B. 25)." Koch remarks (*Hist. Gram.* 2, 46): "Der Optativ oder Conjunctiv des Präteritums mag ursprünglich die Aussage als eine solche hinstellen, deren Verwirklichung der Sprechende wünscht, wahrscheinlich schon im Ags., etwa wie: "Wälā, āhte ic mīnra handa geweald (*ach, hätte ich doch meincr Hände Gewalt*). C. 23, 32." Köch's example is not very conclusive, for Mätzner cites it as an example of a conditional sentence (3, 485): "Ahte ic mīnra handa geweald, and mōste āne tid ūte weorðan, wesān āne winterstunde, þonne ic mid þis werode—." Mätzner's example does not conform to the instances that are familiar in modern English, because we should not naturally class it as a *utinam*-sentence, but rather as an elliptical sentence of command.

I have, however, found an example to which I believe no exception can be taken. It occurs in the Hatton MS. of the *Cura Pastoralis*, p. 445 of Sweet's edition, and is a translation of Rev. 3, 15: "Ealā, wære hē āuðer, oððe hāt oððe ceald!" Perhaps further search would bring other instances to light.

ALBERT S. COOK.

Yale University.



## FRENCH PRONUNCIATION.

TO THE EDITORS OF MOD. LANG. NOTES.

SIRS:—One is inclined eagerly to examine a paper<sup>1</sup> having for its subject the interesting topic chosen by Prof. McKibben. More than a year ago Prof. Koschwitz had published his *Parlers Parisiens*,<sup>2</sup>—a book that will always be prized for its valuable introduction in which the author gives a condensed, but complete, history of French pronunciation. With the impressions gained from a perusal of the latter volume fresh in the mind, a reader is likely to be disappointed in Prof. McKibben's pamphlet since it contains nothing new; furthermore, difficulty is experienced in attempting to discover on what principle the old material is arranged.

The general idea of the first part (pp. 1-7) seems to be that Paris furnishes the model for French pronunciation; that the number of people whose speech is accepted as correct is increasing rapidly and is no longer confined to any especial class. The writer next considers "the fact that those who speak well employ several kinds of good usage;" he illustrates this by alluding to the divergencies which appear in transcriptions of similar texts by Koschwitz and by Passy. Then, after referring to the constant but gradual changes taking place in language, he concludes:

"With these thoughts in mind, we may and should look for new light upon French pronunciation. But the old standard or standards, though slowly changing, are still valid; to them must conform all words and the pronunciation of those who use them."

Doubt will probably arise in a reader's mind as to the meaning of the terms "new light" and "old standards;" I think there may be some confusion throughout the article in the employment of the words "standard" and "usage."

Leaving aside these little exceptions, the paper will doubtless prove of value to many

<sup>1</sup> *Standards of French Pronunciation*. By George F. McKibben, Professor of French and German, Denison University, Granville, O: Read before the Ohio Modern Language Association, Dec. 27, 1893. Published by the Association. Columbus: Spahr & Glenn, 10 pp.

<sup>2</sup> Reviewed by Professor A. Rambeau in MOD. LANG. NOTES, ix, 276-285.

who have not made a particular study of the subject or who have not at hand such a manual as that of Koschwitz.

L. EMIL MENDER.

*Johns Hopkins University.*

## DR. HALL'S "REJOINDER."

TO THE EDITORS OF MOD. LANG. NOTES.

SIRS:—Dr. Fitzedward Hall's "Rejoinder" (MOD. LANG. NOTES, Nov. 1894) to my "Not So Very American" requires on my part some comments.

In the *Academy* for March 25, 1893 there appeared a communication from Dr. Hall, under the heading of "The American Dialect," in which many quotations from an American school book were cited as illustrating some of the baser elements of that dialect,—“substitutes” for the words and phrases of genuine English “such as should be pronounced intolerable.” The book from which Dr. Hall cited his examples was Mr. Eggleston's *First Book in American History*.

In reading the quotations from Mr. Eggleston's book, it seemed to me that some of the locutions censured by Dr. Hall were not Americanisms. A glance into a few English books and a hasty search in memoranda prepared for other matters quickly supplied, from British writings, citations parallel to a dozen or more locutions quoted from Mr. Eggleston. In the circumstances, I thought it worth while to point out the parallelism, and I did so in a very temperate, unpretentious little paper having the title, "Not So Very American," printed in MOD. LANG. NOTES, December, 1893. It was not at all within the scope of my remarks (much expanded in apparent length by the quotations supporting them) to "animadvert" on the opinions that made the staple of Dr. Hall's letter to the *Academy*.

But Dr. Hall, explaining the meaning of his *Academy* letter in seven columns of "Rejoinder" to my parallel quotations, scouts the idea that the locutions capped were cited by him as Americanisms. His rejection of the thought is vehement:

"The aim of Mr. Williams is to lay at my door that for which, if he made good his contention, I should justly be an object of contemptuous derision."

So far, then, there is progress. The locutions capped by parallel British citations are not Americanisms, and were not regarded as such by Dr. Hall. There remains to be considered whether my attributing to Dr. Hall the opinion that they were Americanisms involved an unreasonable construction and interpretation of his *Academy* letter,—or, to put the query somewhat differently,—whether Dr. Hall's "Rejoinder" does not read into his *Academy* letter esoteric meanings and restrictions that are not discoverable in the unexpounded text.

Dr. Hall's "Rejoinder" says: "Early last year there appeared in the London *Academy*, some strictures by me, under the heading of 'The American Dialect.'" In no part of the "Rejoinder" is there an intimation that the heading, as printed, was imposed (as might have happened) on his communication by the editor of the *Academy*. The title of the letter, "The American Dialect," may fairly be regarded, then, as indicating Dr. Hall's view of its subject-matter. But his "Rejoinder," in MOD. LANG. NOTES, shows that while, under the heading of "The American Dialect," he was censuring "locutions which go far to realize finished debasement"—(an odd purpose of theirs, but no matter)—and was illustrating such locutions from an American book exclusively, he really had in mind, not a dialect peculiarly American, but an international dialect—a dialect common to America and England. This concealed meaning of the *Academy* letter could not have been reached by an uninitiated student of it, and naturally, therefore, I supposed that *Americanisms* were referred to by "substitutes" in the passage subjoined. The reader should bear in mind that, in this passage and in the subsequent ones quoted, "our," "we" and "us" refer to *Americans*.

"For genuine English is no longer practically our portion, and our teaching it for every day purposes would be an anachronism. Instances are most abundant in which we have, instead of its words and phrases, substitutes for them. Of the difference in quality between such of these substitutes as are tolerable and such as should be pronounced intolerable, not many of us, however, have other than a hazy conception. By way of illustration, in the issue of the *Educational Review* for May of last year, the epithet "admirable," and with-

out discrimination of particulars, is applied to Mr. Edward Eggleston's *First Book in American History*. And "admirable," in the sense of the term now obsolete, that performance, for its corruptness of dialect, assuredly is. It is to this feature of it that, in the interest of sound and rational culture, I would invite the attention of our educationists."<sup>1</sup>

It is a curious example of Dr. Hall's processes of thought that, in his "Rejoinder," he explains "substitutes" in the foregoing passage in the following manner:

"To nothing else could I, of course, refer, by "substitutes," "tolerable" and "intolerable," than justifiable innovations, on the one hand, and, on the other hand, solecisms, gratuitous departures from right English, whether home bred or international."<sup>2</sup>

Unquestionably since Dr. Hall says so. But how was an outsider to know it? Certainly not from the *Academy* letter itself. Under "of course," as a safeconduct, there is brought in a lot of matter that (to the uninitiated) is new. In this new matter "genuine English" is displaced by "right English" carrying a bagful of different intendments; for "right English" excludes *bad* English: whereas, *bad* English may be as truly *genuine* English as *bad* wine may be *genuine* wine. The expository skill that changed "genuine English" into "right English," in so doing, changed the limitation, and therefore the sense, of "substitutes." In "substitutes" for the words and phrases of "genuine English" there is an implication of something foreign; but there is not such an implication in "substitutes" for the words and phrases of "right English": the latter substitutes might be strictly English in origin and use. If the "substitutes" for the words and phrases of "right English" were current in both England and the United States, they might (perhaps) be regarded as constituents of an international dialect, and so the quotations from Mr. Eggleston's book might illustrate—not *Americanisms*—but base locutions used in such international dialect. I do not deny the existence of international dialects; but that the quotations from Mr. Eggleston, in the *Academy* letter, were cited by Dr. Hall as

<sup>1</sup> *The Academy*, p. 265, col. 3.

<sup>2</sup> MOD. LANG. NOTES, vol. ix, cols. 442-3.

illustrations of an international dialect could not, I am confident, have been known without the supplementary explanations in "A Rejoinder." It is true that among the locutions censured (more than fifty) there are two (or three) that are spoken of in the letter as being used in England by the baser sort; but it would have been a most inexcusable construction of the letter to have made its drift turn on by-matter that seemed to have got into it casually: such a construction of its purport would have sacrificed all that was most distinct and prominent in it to that which was comparatively insignificant. For any doubt which the presence of those locutions might raise in the mind of a careful reader would be put to rest by matter that soon follows the comments on them—matter in which the avowal is made by Dr. Hall that, "though I have lived away from America upwards of forty-six years, I feel, to this hour, in writing English, that I am writing a foreign language,"—and especially would the reader's doubt be dissipated by the following passage:

"To return to Mr. Eggleston, it would be idle to contend that his Americanisms have not, in large share, the countenance of all our later writers of any conspicuous note, a mere handful of them, the very choicest, omitted from account. And even these Americanize in some measure."<sup>3</sup>

That a supplemental commentary was needed for the right understanding of the *Academy* letter will be evident to any one who compares that letter with the exposition of it in "A Rejoinder." I read it very carefully two or three times before writing "Not So Very American," and thought I understood it; I was conscious of difficulties in reconciling all its parts, but I believed I had succeeded in construing them not only reasonably but rightly. As one of the elements of such reasonable and right construction "our linguistic innovations," in the passage subjoined, was interpreted by me as meaning *Americanisms*:

"In so saying, I of course imply that our linguistic innovations, some of which have established themselves ineradicably, and are, in fact, indispensable, are by no means to be condemned without exception. At present,

<sup>3</sup> *The Academy*, p. 266, col 3.

however, without undertaking the defence of such of them as are defensible, I limit myself to deprecating those which are indefensible [compare with "substitutes," "tolerable" and "intolerable" previously noted], either as being entirely gratuitous or on other grounds equally valid. Of innovations of this description, which so commonly disfigure American English, the number, I repeat is very great. Manifestly, then, their diffusion and their constant increase call for grave consideration. That a duty devolves on us, in connexion with them, is what I would suggest by this slight paper."<sup>4</sup>

What could "our linguistic innovations," as used in that paragraph, mean, if it did not mean *Americanisms*? If Dr. Hall's "slight paper" was not deprecating "indefensible" Americanisms, and illustrating them by quotations from Mr. Eggleston's book, what, then, was its purport? Nobody, I am sure, could have known before the true exposition appeared in "A Rejoinder." Dr. Hall was deprecating and illustrating "gratuitous departures from right English, whether home-bred or international."—See "Rejoinder," columns 443-4 and 446.—Briefly summing up, Dr. Hall was deprecating and illustrating—not indefensible *Americanisms*—but the British-American "plebeianism" of the American international dialect.

And yet, in the *Academy* letter (p. 266, col. 3.), Dr. Hall said;

"Already, too, we [Americans] owe to it [our zeal] a *specific* character, extending in its manifold *distinctiveness*, to our speech. Circumstances generated by unprecedented combinations have entailed on us a recognizable dialect, and one which is rapidly developing."

The italics are mine. One can see there are difficulties in that letter, even now.

R. O. WILLIAMS.

New York.

#### BRIEF MENTION.

A new edition of Mérimée's *Colomba* has come to us from the Cambridge University Press (London: C. J. Clay and Sons). The editor, Mr. Arthur R. Ropes, of King's College, has performed the task with much care and credit. The introduction gives a few de-

<sup>4</sup> *Ibid.*



tails about Mérimée's life and literary career, and furnishes some discussion as to the story itself. It is a matter for regret that the tale should have been abridged by some thirty or forty pages. The habit of shortening or meddling, in any manner, with original texts is seldom productive of good results, especially when applied to so closely woven a tale as *Colomba* is. A cursory glance at Chapter iii has fully convinced us of this fact. We miss the *ballata* bearing so strong a local coloring, and so effectively dramatic, referring as it does to the death of Orso's father. The dialogue between the young Englishwoman and the lieutenant is most summarily disposed of; Orso's first question is met by Miss Nevil with this curt and disobliging answer: 'Oh il nous contait une vieille histoire' and she then promptly retires to her state-room! The transition between the two last paragraphs decidedly lacks smoothness; then, we are left in ignorance of Orso's real opinion of the *vendetta*, what it is to the Corsican peasant and how practised by him, the graphic details bearing on these points having been suppressed; and yet Miss Nevil, on page 19, is made to repeat to Orso the same words that he is supposed to have uttered in the omitted part. Mérimée ends this chapter by a description first of the scenery around the bay of Ajaccio (this, Mr. Ropes incorporated in his text); then proceeds to picture to us the aspects of the city itself: the stillness of the streets, broken only by the appearance of a few idle faces, the utter absence of loud talk, laughter and singing; ominous pistol shots betraying an excited game of cards, and, at evetide, foreigners alone promenading on the Corso, whilst the inhabitants remain on the look-out on their threshold, like the falcons on their nests. These Mr. Ropes cannot call 'added details of secondary importance to the picture'; the notes are excellent, but could easily have been curtailed to make room for *Colomba's* unabridged text. The Grammar so often referred to in the notes is the *Wellington French College Grammar* by Messrs. Eve and De Baudiss, very little, if at all, in use in the United States. The English system of treating a French grammar like a Latin grammar is not in vogue in this country, and the American youth would lose both courage and patience in seeing some sixteen varieties

of dative case. The watch-word in England seems to be 'Maximum French Grammar;' here, for the time being, it is 'Minimum.'—On page 84, l. 16, the editor seems to establish a difference between 'm'avoir sauvé un coup de couteau' and 'm'avoir sauvé d'un coup de couteau,' the first meaning 'saved from stabbing,' the other 'saved from being stabbed.' The two French expressions have but one and the same meaning, both implying passivity. Moreover a careful reading of the text justifies only the passive meaning 'saved from being stabbed.'

The *Festschrift til Vilhelm Thomson fra Disciple* is a graceful tribute most richly deserved. Dr. Thomson has probably done more than any other one man to raise the standard of philological work at the University of Copenhagen to its present high state of excellence. The volume contains twenty articles on linguistic and literary subjects, ranging from a study of of a guttural nasal in Urfinisch to topographical remarks on Xenophon. Of special interest to general students of literature is an account by E. Gigas of the original plan of Bayle's *Dictionnaire*, which was recently discovered by him in the Thott collection of MSS. in the Royal Library at Copenhagen. Finnur Jónsson's "Fremmede ords behandling i oldnordisk digtning" is characteristically thorough and throws much light on a hitherto neglected subject. Among other articles may be mentioned V. Andersen's "Sammen fald og beröring;" O. Jespersen's "Om subtraktionsdannelser;" Kr. Nyrop's "Et afsnit of ordenes liv" and P. K. Thorsens "Glidning og spring." The mechanical execution of the work is beautiful in the extreme.

#### PERSONAL.

Dr. Joseph Hendren Gorrell, who is now Professor of Modern Languages in Wake Forest College, N. C., is a graduate of Washington and Lee University (A. B. 1888, A. M. 1890), where in 1890-91 he held the office of Assistant Professor of Modern Languages. After a graduate course of three years in the Modern Languages, with English as his principal subject, at the Johns Hopkins University, he obtained the degree of Doctor of Philosophy in June, 1894. His dissertation is a study of "Indirect Discourse in Anglo-Saxon."